kolai N. Varvartsev

Ukrainian History in the Distorting Mirror of Sovietology

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
OF THE UKRAINIAN SSR
INSTITUTE OF HISTORY

Nikolai N. Varvartsev

Ukrainian History in the Distorting Mirror of Sovietology

KIEV NAUKOVA DUMKA PUBLISHERS 1987

This monograph purports to analyze the social and political background to one particular line of Western Sovietology — "Ukrainian studies" and the role of the military-industrial complex and other components of the corporate Establishment in starting and keeping them up. The evidence it contains lays bare the pro-imperialist activities of Sovietological centres, the slanted sources they draw on, and the machinery they use to spread their anti-Communist fabrications. There is special searchlight on the criticism of concepts of the historiography of the problems of the history of the Ukraine existing within the framework of these centres.

Translated into English by *Lev Bobrov*

Edited by *Igor Gulyants*

Editorial Office of History

B $\frac{0501000000-379}{M221(04)-87}$ 30-87

© Naukova Dumka, 1987

FOREWORD

In the last few decades there has been a spate of publications in the West about the history of the Soviet Union. This indicates that the U.S.S.R. is in the limelight of international opinion. People want to know as much as possible about the world's first Socialist State and about the factors that have enabled it to put an end to the backwardness and destitution inherited from the old Czarist regime and to reach the foremost frontiers of world progress. The gains of Socialism have been all the more impressive since they have been achieved within an extremely short time and in the face of unending harassment by imperialism, ranging from economic and political pressure and ideological subversion to outright counter-revolutionary plots.

Of course, far from all of what has been published about the U.S.S.R. in the West is of equal value in terms of content, validity of interpretations and factual evidence. There is a variety of reasons behind that. However, it would be inexcusable to fail to see that there are publications of an entirely different kind in capitalist countries about U.S.S.R., those built on pre-conceived notions, ill-feeling and, quite often, intestine hatred for the Soviets.

Among the publications of that kind, there are the so-called Ukrainian studies purposing to present the history of the Ukraine. They abound in absurdities and gross distortions of her past and present.

Naturally, such treatment of social development, however disguised as "scientific knowledge", requires critical analysis. And not just in order to establish how far the particular interpretations correspond to the real facts and events. It is very important, in our judgement, to lay bare the roots of the distortions and their social meaning. And one cannot do that without looking historically at the printed matter put on sale for readers to consume...

In Western publications and social sciences, one comes across certain ill-defined notions which cause confusion.

This applies, in particular, to the term "nationalism" used in different, sometimes diametrically opposite connotations, quite often for unseemly purposes. The most obvious case in point is an attempt to lump together the struggle for national liberation and those organizations, groups, and classes that sow the seeds of hatred for other peoples. This confusion, whether intentional or unintentional, is dangerous because there can be an attempt to justify crimes against humanism and humanity, quite often under a national flag. Accepting such uncertain methodology means paving the way for a downright travesty of history, as one can easily see from the writings of some "Ukrainologists".

It is noteworthy that there is a growing realization among some historians in the U.S., Canada, and Western Europe of nationalism as an expression of ethnic intolerance leading up to outright aggression and genocide (the example of German Nazism in the days of the Third Reich as the most extreme manifestation of nationalism is rather indicative). They consider — and one would not quarrel with that presumption — that it is impossible by using those concepts built on ethnic intolerance to get an objective idea of the history of any particular people or bring out the key trends in the development of any particular country.

In this book the author has set out not only to wade through a pack of lies in some monographs and collected articles published in the West, but also to bring out the true image of those who, while pretending to study history, incite mistrust of, and hostility towards the U.S.S.R. and other countries free from imperialism in their development, and so play into the hands of the forces intent on obstructing normal relations among nations, mutual understanding, good-neighbourly attitudes and co-operation of peoples.

Chapter I

SOCIAL CUSTOMERS FOR HOSTILE STEREOTYPES

The history of bourgeois society offers incontrovertible evidence to show that as its inherent social-economic and political contradictions and conflicts sharpen, the very structure of State power undergoes change reflecting the ruling Establishment's increasingly active role in relation to the ideological factor in public life. The net effect is to build up a special system of mental violence over the mass of people. That is an enforced backlash at the acceleration of world development due to the involvement of hundreds of millions in social and political life.

The dynamic quality of social change is more and more often recognized by bourgeois ideologues. "The world is getting more political than it has ever been" [1], said the American historian, Karl Deutsch. Being unable to arrest the working-class movement, imperialist elements are seeking to deform it and prevent it from resolving the fundamental problems of social existence. To this end, they are making harder efforts to manipulate the political thinking of the population and mastermind its behaviour by means of stereotypes misrepresenting the new, advanced social system which has arisen in the wake of the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917. Thansplanting ideological differences into international relations has since been the dominant line in imperialist policy.

1. UNDER IMPERIAL DOCTRINES

Further moves along this line were made upon the ending of the Second World War when influential reactionary circles laid claim to world supremacy and to the right to tell their bidding to all nations and peoples. These claims were rightly seen to have given rise to the policy of confrontation. It is the shaping and making of this policy that dictated the Establishment ideology of the U.S.— the main capitalist Power. It started casting about more feverishly

than ever before for all kinds of "historical", "moral" and other motivations to justify its imperial ambitions. That was what made the superior echelons of power anxious to exploit slanted misinterpretations of the social and political development of Socialist countries. Back in the late '40s those policy-makers turned to the Ukrainian theme in search of concepts to cover up their action to wreck peace and international security. One cannot fail to note that this interest had germinated in the department of foreign policy and came as a sequel to its closer relationship with ideology and propaganda. Their interpenetration increased as international relations turned into an area of fierce struggle against the forces of social progress and, above all, the Soviet Union, using all kinds of tactics, including the dirtiest of them.

The abrupt turnabout of the U.S. ruling Establishment from a course that favoured co-operation with the Soviet Union to the policy of what came to be known as the Cold War was the major catalyst of the continued fusion of foreign policy and ideology. Describing that line of approach to international affairs, an authority on foreign affairs, Saul Padover, professor of political science and history, underlined that for the United States "psychological warfare" was part of foreign policy [2]. Trans-Atlantic strategists reserved a certain place to the Ukrainian theme even in the doctrine of "containment" constructed on the ground of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism. It was presented in a deliberately obscure fashion in items intended for publication.

The "liberation" doctrine that replaced it treated the "subject of Soviet nationalities" in a still more outspokenly aggressive way as integral to American policy. A theorist and propagandist of that doctrine, James Burnham, counting as he did on a break-up of the Socialist community and disruption of the unity of the peoples of the U.S.S.R., produced a book *Containment or Liberation*? in which he slandered the Ukrainian people by calling them a "captive nation" and cited the action of the "groups of resistance", the remnants of the Nazi-recruited quisling bands, as "evidence" of the main postulate of the doctrine — insistence on armed intervention by imperialism in the internal affairs of the U.S.S.R.[3]

Both doctrines which acquired an official status were directed toward a confrontation with the Soviet Union. Yet the failure of these designs prompted a trend that came to be known as "bridge-building" soon after it took shape at the turn of the '60s. Its central point was to plan for under-

mining world Socialism from within, thereby counting on the fragmentation of the world Socialist system, i. e., the evolution of each of its countries towards self-isolation. A slanted interpretation of national relations was being pressed with growing insistence as one of the principal means of realizing these objectives [4]. Plans were afoot not only to sow the seeds of mistrust between the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries, but to stir up ethnic strife inside the Soviet Union as well. That policy was built, notably, on the provocative argument about "increasing restlessness among the Soviet Union's non-Russian nations", proffered by one of the authors of the doctrine, Zbigniew Brzezinski [5].

The main points of the "bridge-building" doctrine, which was finally formulated during Lyndon Johnson's presidency, have been taken into account in the foreign policy making by the subsequent U.S. governments. In the publications of its advocates, the "Ukrainian theme" was tied to plans to infect the public mind with the germ of ethnic intolerance. One of American "scientific" advisers on "Ukrainian questions", M. Luther maintained that "in the game" which the Western Powers were playing on the international chessboard the " 'Ukraine' always seems to evoke the response of 'nationalism' " [6]. By "nationalism", they mean a separation of the Ukraine from the rest of the Soviet Union and establishment of such a scheme of things in it as would please the Moguls of the "free world". The term "nationalism", often used positively in Western literature, here is synonimous with chauvinism, separatism, anti-Sovietism, anti-Communism, put together. So to use a term that many progressive-minded readers would take sympathetically is, in this case, to put a good face on a bad game.

Yet, this "game" is quite widespread in Western publications on political science and historiography. They all indicate that the "Ukrainian theme" is being persistently squeezed into the framework of the foreign policy strategy of the main imperialist Power, while its interpretations are intended for the propaganda of anti-Sovietism and anti-Communism. This approach of the Trans-Atlantic political oracles is confirmed by the motives that are taken as the guide to action in the U.S. as, indeed, in a number of other Western countries, in what they call "Ukrainian studies". One of the men, incorporated into U.S. university Sovietology, O. Fedyshyn, sought to explain the "study" of the 1917-1918 events in the Ukraine not by the very essence of the historical problem itself, but by the present-day development

of the Republic — its economic potential, population numbers, as also geographic position [7].

Sovietologists turn to the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in an effort to provide all kinds of ward politicians with misconstructions of inter-community relations in the U.S.S.R. and under Socialism in general. The history of the post-war decades has enough evidence to show that this kind of "angle" has been predetermined by the very pattern of activity of the U.S. executive authority, above all, that of the President whose public pronouncemenst reflect the line which the ruling Establishment wants to be taken on any particular set of problems. This is most clearly demonstrated by the yearly "captive nations week", an anti-Communist propaganda exercise announced by the President in what is advertised as defence of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and other Socialist countries which imperialists call 'captive nations'.

The role of presidential authority in backing up slanted theories about the U.S.S.R. is thrown in relief by his attitude to reactionary organizations engaged in slanderous propaganda against the Ukraine. Their chiefs frequent the President's press conferences where they are allowed to play their own part in moulding public opinion. An oft-repeated form of encouraging anti-Soviet theories regarding the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic are the presidential messages of greetings to "ethnic" organizations, engaged in noisy propaganda, on the occasion of their congresses, anniversaries etc. At the height of the Cold War, such messages were openly seditious. This "tradition" was started by Harry S. Truman who, in an official message to the former Ukrainian collaborationists of the Nazi Reich, late in 1949, promised them "support and guardianship". That line was built on during the Eisenhower presidency. In his message of December 1955, on the 15th anniversary of one of the coordinating centres of anti-Soviet immigrant organizations — the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America (UCCA) — he expressed his "appreciation" for its "efforts to combat international Communism" [8].

The White House has special subdivisions to keep up contact with "ethnic" organizations and direct their activities. It was under Truman that the office of assistant for relations with "national minorities" was instituted. The White House, just like other U.S. authorities, invariably recognizes anti-Soviet centres behind "Ukrainian" signboards as their representatives.

Special subdivisions at top government level have been

set up to get the organizations of ethnic minorities to do public relations for federal policy over the continued aggravation of racial and ethnic conflicts inside the U.S. At the same time, one task has been to damp down the outcry against mass discrimination by reforms that never go to the heart of the problem. Special emphasis has been on distracting the attention of the masses from urgent domestic issues by whipping up anti-Soviet and anti-Communist campaigns.

This trend can be seen in the establishment of constant links between government institutions and "ethnic" centres committed to anti-Sovietism and with "their" press. One of the principal objectives of the meetings with representatives of the "ethnic" groups, as high-ranking officials have often pointed out, is to let them bring up the "special problems which the United States has faced in its relations abroad and to help... to understand those problems". In actual fact, the "problems" raised by the ringleaders of these groups boil down to casting aspersions on ethnic relations in the Soviet Union. Increased playing up of the "ethnic factor" by the ruling class and its parties in the political struggle reached its highest point in the 1980 election campaign [9].

The self-righteous appeals from these quarters to "ethnic groups" have been laying fertile ground for the flourishing of all kinds of falsifiers of history and of the present-day development of the Soviet peoples. Each and everyone of the post-war presidents has had at least some of their closest advisers in one way or another involved in "Ukrainian studies". One of them, just by way of example, is Richard Pipes, first an adviser for East European affairs in the National Security Council and then a White House consultant. As an author of some Sovietological writings, notably, those dealing with the Soviet education system, he has worked "hard enough" to distort the history of the Ukraine, trying to present it as keynoted by a "struggle" between the Ukrainians and the Russians [10].

The injection of anti-Soviet postulates into foreign policy galvanized the "Ukrainological" activities of the U.S. Department of State. One of the organizers of American Sovietology was Philip Mosely, the man who had initiated a special plan for the "study of the Ukraine", geared to U.S. foreign policy objectives, and the selection of appropriate "specialists" among former Nazi henchmen. He had been involved in American foreign policy making for the postwar period while the Second World War was still going on.

In considering "Ukrainology" as a means to organize "public opinion," the foreign policy makers appeal to the UCCA-type organizations as the sole representatives of one of the nation's ethnic communities. This approach sprang from the Smith-Mundt Bill which was passed in 1948, that is, in the early Cold War years, which made a point of "private agencies" in the conduct of foreign policy. Under that Bill, the Secretary of State was expected to use the "services and facilities of private agencies to the maximum extent practicable" [11].

Accordingly, the State Department has a machinery in operation to inspire "public opinion" in the U.S. and abroad. One of its instruments is the press conferences held for editors of American newspapers, broadcasting and television companies. Adepts of anti-Communism attend them on a regular basis as representatives of the "ethnic" press. They get briefed on various aspects of relations between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. and on Soviet home affairs. Within the same machinery, official Washington dishes up its allegations of "strained" ethnic relations in the U.S.S.R. for the media to air. These contacts are of an outspokenly seditious character at closed briefings as typified by the conference held on May 17, 1977. As the *Ukrainian Quarterly* magazine of New York blurted out, a State Department spokesman who addressed it in connection with the hypocritical "human rights campaign" launched by the Carter Administration, made it clear, while speaking about "struggle" for national rights, that the State Department would back up hostile action against the Ukrainian Republic along these lines [12].

It is indicative that the State Department tries to play up the "Ukrainian theme" most amid imperialist-engineered crisis situations and campaigns to stir up anti-Communist feeling around the world. For example, the conference held by the State Department in Washington in October 1982 was about a propaganda build-up for yet another "crusade" which the White House was launching against Socialist countries, notably, Poland. A few score representatives of "research" and propaganda centres, including some "experts" on fake stories about the Ukraine, were urged to bring more of academic science into such campaigns.

The State Department's official correspondence has also taken on a seditious character. In its replies to appeals and "solicitations" from rightist and extreme rightist organizations, the State Department has been, to all intents and purposes, subscribing to their fabrications about the Ukrainian Republic, assuring them that material of this kind will

be distributed through diplomatic channels as "reaction of American public opinion".

Another producer of far-fetched stories on the subject of ethnic relations under Socialism is the United States Information Agency (USIA). Ever since its inception, it has been placing orders for "research studies" about the contemporary development and history of the Ukraine, notably, to meet the rising demand of the Voice of America and its "Ukrainian section." The selection and interpretation of material about the Ukrainian Republic are governed by the official USIA document *Statement of Strategic Principles* where "the struggle with world Communism" is treated "as an important aspect of USIA objectives" [13]. This line is directed by the National Security Council which shapes common objectives for international propaganda. USIA chiefs have more than once emphasized that to realize the objectives of the anti-Communist strategy means to use anti-Sovietism in "psycho-political war" [14].

Since the USIA is supposed to exploit and coordinate the activities of "private" organizations, it supplies them with special instructions worked out on the basis of "research studies" made by Sovietologists. These "experts" are also involved in deciding the pattern of "presentation" of Ukrainian problems in the media — the press, broadcasting and television services. One guidepost for imperialist propaganda is the USIA's "theoretical" mouthpiece — *Problems of Communism.* Licensed "Ukrainologists" also contribute their "research findings" to it. The articles they produce have nothing like an objective analysis of the economy and culture of the Ukraine or of the life of the working people of this Republic within the Soviet commonwealth: all they contain is a misinterpretation of Leninist ethnic relations policy. Reviews of Western literature, which the magazine carries from time to time, recommend nothing beyond writings which falsify the history of the Ukrainian people [15].

2. LEGISLATORS COMMITTED TO EXTRA-CONSTITUTIONALISM

The hostile approach of imperialist elements to the U.S.S.R. in the postwar period can be seen in the activities of representatives of the U.S. top law-making body — the Congress. With its functions progressively transformed, Congress has been intruding more and more into the ideological field which an adviser to the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, Pat Holt, has described as its "extra-constitutional

role"[16]. True, Western students limit themselves to stating the outward attributes of this functional novelty of a government body, never going to its roots. Yet the legislators' ideological activity proceeds in a prescribed direction and quite often boils down to anti-Communist insinuations during the discussion of many issues connected with government action and distribution of appropriations, and designed to influence a large body of public opinion. That is the effect that individual Congressmen and Senators count on when they take up various episodes from the present life and the past history of the Ukrainian people.

It is indicative that the speeches the legislators make cannot be considered "spontaneous" and "free" even by the standards of bourgeois democracy, because their presentation is regulated within the framework of projected campaigns eventually designed to prove the immutability of the system of exploitation of man by man. One of them takes place every year in both Houses in January in connection with the so-called IVth Edict of the bourgeois nationalist Central Rada, which declared the Ukraine's secession from Soviet Russia in 1918 in order to fight against the Socialist Revolution. The Rada's historically unavoidable collapse, brought about by the action of millions of Ukrainian working people, has been presented by the organizers of that campaign as a result of "intervention of the Russian forces". All that some Representatives and Senators saw in the Civil War was a "historical" excuse for their diatribes about a "subjugated" Ukraine. For example, Congressman P. Raser, speaking in January 1974, tried to picture the collapse of the puppet bourgeois "governments" during the period of the struggle of the working people of the Ukraine for the establishment of the Soviet system of government as "destruction" of Ukrainian statehood[17]. The lamentation of the bankrupt counter-revolutionary institutions has been going on together with attacks on the Socialist State created by the workers and peasants of the Ukraine and by demands for the American government's intervention in the affairs of a sovereign Soviet Republic[18]. That is to say that the whole idea behind the campaigns in Congress has been to spread illusions both in the U.S. and outside about bourgeois statehood as the only form of government that can guarantee freedom to peoples and in that way mitigate what was an increasingly critical attitude of the masses towards the bourgeois institutions of power, including the U.S. Congress itself, which deprive millions of Americans of social security and other elementary rights.

The tendency to make that kind of propaganda look consistent with a "historical knowledge" of the U.S.S.R. first made itself evident in the 1950s. Stories about "economic exploitation", "persecution of religion", "harassment of culture", and the like, invented by the pseudo-experts on the "Ukrainian problem", have been told from the Congressional podium more than once.

The legislators' activity, clearly at variance with the official functions of Congress, has been, as one can see from the record of the last few decades, part and parcel of the propaganda activities designed to scare the Americans with a "Soviet threat" and lavishly financed by the ruling corporate interests. The speeches of Congressmen on "Ukrainian" subjects have been essentially consonant with those of full-time anti-Sovieteers at their gatherings in New York, Chicago, and other cities.

The spirit of anti-Sovietism has also inspired the hearings in Congressional Committees which heard falsified facts about the history and present-day development of the Soviet Republics cited as "examples." It is the "students" and "experts" invited from Sovietological and similar centres that have been "testifying" in such hearings. It is indicative that one of the first to ask for "information" about the Ukrainian Republic was the so-called Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression, created by out-and-out reactionaries in the 1950s. Its chairman, Charles Kersten, unerringly established that the services required could be provided by individuals whose readiness to slander Soviet realities followed from the status of criminals on the run to escape a fair trial by their own people. So, the Committee came to hear former Hitler's flunkeys who acted not only as "witnesses", but even as "advisers". As his closest advisers, Kersten employed fascist "Ukrainologists" who had feathered their nests at Marquette and some other universities.

The Kersten Committee's activities provided ample evidence to demonstrate the time-serving interest in the "studies" of Sovietologists. 'Nationalist' theories were played up in the course of the hearings in the context of a close-fought election tussle between the Republican and Democratic Parties for control over the nation's top machinery of political power. The Republicans, for instance, used fabrications about ethnic relations in the Soviet Union to try and justify the "advantages" of their own anti-Communist strategy in front of the doctrine of "containment" which had been produced by the Democrats. One particular piece of

evidence to that effect was the *Special Report* on the Ukrainian Republic with records of the Kersten Committee hearings [19].

Using misinterpretations of inter-community relations in the U.S.S.R. as some of the "arguments" during the discussion of the problems of international development and the foreign policy of the American Administration has become one of the methods of struggle by the extreme Right-wing elements against any effort to ease tensions in the world and improve relations between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. In 1974, when the issues of promoting detente held the attention of the world community, representatives of the Right and extreme Right in Congress launched their full-scale attacks. At a meeting of the Congressional Ways and Means Committee on April 4, Leo Dobriansky, who had arrived from Georgetown University, presented his "revelations" about the position of religion and the Church in the Ukrainian Republic and cautioned against American-Soviet partnership on equal terms [20]. One character that was summoned from Carleton University, Canada, for hearings on "detente and human rights", organized in the Europe Sub-Committee, in July was a "Ukrainologist" B. Bociurkiw, who, reiterating the false stories about "violation" of ethnic, religious and political rights in the Ukrainian Republic, called in question the expediency of the policy of business relations between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

In distributing its anti-Soviet versions, Congress has been generously offering its official publications for speeches and articles by advocates of all kinds of "crusades", couched in hostile terms in respect of our country, as well as texts of lectures on "history" delivered by falsifiers at universities to advertise anti-Communist fake stories about the Ukraine. It has likewise been sponsoring the publication of collections of speeches by legislators engaged in "Ukrainian" propaganda shows. One thing that claims attention is the choice of sources they draw on. Preference is invariably given to the writings that contain insinuations against the friendship and co-operation of the peoples of the Soviet Union. Back in the Cold War years, Congressman A. Bosh, while calling for one of such articles about the Ukraine to be included in official records, tried to explain it by the need to wage psychological warfare against Communism [21].

Lobbyism has been intensively used as a propaganda instrument by anti-Soviet organizations in the postwar period. American researchers (notably the well-known historian and diplomat George Kennan) have singled out the pre-

sence of "ethnic pressure groups" as a variety of lobbyism. These groups include émigré centres claiming to be called "Ukrainian" and "the majority of them strongly wanted a Soviet-American war," Kennan noted [22]. However, it is dyed-in-the-wool anti-Sovietism that has been rampant here, apart from the dirty tricks that are common to lobbyism, under the guise of struggle for ethnic interests. All the more so since anti-Communist pronouncements by a Congressman or a Senator are regarded as a condition for him to meet if he wants to stay in this top legislature, while the claims of lobbyists that they represent all Ukrainian-born Americans are taken at their face value. In consequence, individual members of both Houses flirt with the agents of reactionary nationalist organizations in the hope to win the votes of the Ukrainian ethnic group making up fairly large communities, up to scores of thousands in some cities.

The claim to speak on behalf of an entire community in front of the élite in power — as American researchers have been pointing out — has invariably been made by the chiefs of some "ethnic" organizations [23]. However, one plain fact to prove such claims to be totally unfounded is that the social make-up of ethnic minorities in the U.S. is not uniform. The exploitative segment, which has created its organizations, constitutes a very small proportion of these ethnic groups. The predominant element is the workers who are represented by their own organizations, including some ethnically inspired and committed to a policy which is diametrically opposite to one of confrontation between nations and peoples. This applies in full measure to the social and political characterization of Ukrainian-born Americans.

One factor conducive to the fuss kicked up by the ethnic lobby is the direct material gain to derive from keeping alive interest in propaganda claptrap about the Soviet Union. Congress is known to finance the operations of federal institutions, like the USIA, the Board for International Broadcasting complete with its smear voices, like Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. These centres employ professional falsifiers of ethnic relations as members of the staff of the "Ukrainian" and other sections.

The connection between the financing of the anti-Communist propaganda machinery and the activity of the ethnic lobby was brought out with ample evidence in the early '70s when Congress heard some of its members speak up against funding Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, the products of the Cold War policy, which was totally incompatible with that of international détente. The panic-stricken

ultra-rightist pushers stepped up their assault on the offices of members of both Houses, bringing forth old kinds of "resolutions" and "letters." Since the matter at issue touched the material interests of Sovietology catering for subversive propaganda to a no lesser extent, its exponents had to drop their alleged "academic" posture this time and openly declare their "concern". "Experts on Soviet affairs", such as Leo Shapiro and Zbigniew Brzezinski joined the pressure campaign against Congress [24]. In that way, the ethnic lobbyists got an additional opportunity, invoking those "authorities", to make no end of high-sounding speeches to remind everyone of their "national" representation.

Speaking of the lobby engaged in organizing those outbursts of anti-Sovietism, one has to note that their machinery is, as a rule, veiled in Western propaganda. "You don't have to speak about all that all the time," the Munich magazine *Sučasnist'*, a mouthpiece of "Ukrainology" financed by American secret services, advised in August 1966, because, as it admitted, the action of legislators juggling with "Ukrainian subjects" have a "lower value" in the eyes of public opinion. Indeed, a special UCCA bureau, created in Washington for lobbying, has been keeping in the shadow. Large sections of the public in the U.S. and in other countries do not know that Congressmen's pronouncements concerning some episodes from the Ukraine's past history and present realities have been based not on a first-hand inquiry into the problems, but on cribs dished up by vituperating anti-Sovieteers. Many of those cribs are originally published in "Ukrainological" periodicals and subsequently offered to Congressmen as "research findings" or "public opinion". The UCCA top crust and its subsidiaries are the principal doers of this dirty work.

One indication to show that the action undertaken by the ethnic lobby is the work of a handful of ward politicians having nothing in common with the absolute majority of the American Ukrainian community is the passage of resolutions in "defence" of religion in the Ukraine tabled by Senator M. Young and by Representative D. Short in June, 1962. Reactionary elements are not discouraged by the fact that their concoctions have never passed the draft stage, getting stuck in the endless files of the Congress. The important thing for them was that the very act of submitting such a draft offered an excuse to perorate in anti-Communist terms in public and at a "high level" which bears out what V. I. Lenin once described as a bourgeois propaganda method: "to lie, scream, raise a hullabaloo, and keep on

reiterating lies — 'something may stick' "[25] The above-mentioned "religious" resolutions were not a product of legislators. As a Chicago gutter journal of the "Ukrainian" ethnic lobby *Samostiyna Ukraina*, which had a negligible circulation, revealed seven years later, they had been compiled by the editor of a clerical weekly *The Way* in Philadelphia. Using his connections in Catholic circles abroad, he organized the signing of appropriate letters in Britain, France and West Germany on behalf of leaders of certain clerical political organizations, and their dispatch to American legislators. Similar tricks have been undertaken in U.S. Congress throughout the postwar period.

To create a semblance of "mass action," the lobbyists seek to shower Congressmen with letters supposedly written by voters. To this end, the reactionary ethnic press suggests outlines of "private letters", inviting the readers to copy one of them and, after signing it, to mail it to the address indicated. Next to them there has been an instruction about how to bring pressure to bear on legislators in their respective states to make them join the anti-Soviet masquerades.

The appearance of Sovietologists in the offices and committees of Congress is not a black-and-white affair. It is a conglomeration of inter-complementary trends — anti-Communist orientation of the "select few" of Big Business and the activities of "private" lobby groups in battle against the "Red danger".

The "Ukrainian" subject matter, treated in the spirit of national insulation and intolerance, is brought into the Congressional business mostly during foreign policy debates. The position of the greatest hostility towards the U.S.S.R. in this case is that of munitions corporations which, as American researchers testify, have been exercising greater pressure on Congress than other "private and non-governmental groups"[26]. Anti-Soviet stories about the "threat of Moscow" are used by the advocates of the military business in a bid to assure the interests of the manufacturers of weapons of mass destruction by the enactment of legislation to step up federal appropriations for military purposes. Quite a few solicitors on behalf of the military business in Congress have been engaged in whipping up anti-Soviet sentiment, notably, by spreading insinuations about the Ukrainian Republic.

3. BEHIND THE SCENES OF PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

The history of the 20th century which has brought out new features in the evolution of the capitalist order of society in its imperialist stage has shown that the bourgeois class has by far outmatched the earlier methods of pre-monopoly capitalism of enlisting the services of social sciences to do their job for them. The machinery of the State is widely used to this end in modern times. It is increasingly operating as an undisguised organizer of "research" to map out and follow through an imperialist course of action in any area, including foreign policy. There has been a particularly close connection ever since the inter-war period between the State and the bourgeois carriers of historical, economic, and other knowledge in the operation of special subversion services which has been most carefully kept secret from the masses.

So-called psychological warfare has been part and parcel of such secret operations. As American theorists define it, it is an activity conducted for military purposes not only in the course of outright hostilities, but in time of peace as well. It implies using all methods of subversion — sabotage, wrecking, provocation, disinformation, etc [27]. With a view to influencing human behaviour in the direction that the aggressor wants it influenced, psychological warfare (American publications are using other terms, too, to denote it — "psychological operations", "psychopolitical war", etc.) includes extensive use of special acts of an ideological character. Allen Dulles urged the intrusion of intelligence services into the public mind in a memorandum on intelligence activity "in time of peace", compiled soon after the end of World War II for the Senate Armed Services Committee. "We must deal with the problem of conflicting ideologies," he lectured, pointing out that there must be intelligence intervention "not only in the relations between Soviet Russia and the countries of the West, but in the internal political conflicts with the countries of Europe, Asia and South America" [28]. The idea of the involvement of the American intelligence service in the ideological battle was recorded in the documents of the Council on Foreign Relations of New York — a Big Business organization created to influence U.S. foreign policy making. The list of the types of secret operations it contained mentioned "covert propaganda". Along with other types of secret activity, it is qualified as an instrument whereby "the CIA intervenes in the domestic

affairs of other nations"[29]. As admitted by Harry Rositzke, who held high offices in the CIA for over 20 years connected with the planning and execution of undercover operations against the U.S.S.R., including the Ukrainian Republic, such intervention has been directed towards "weakening" Communists both in Socialist countries and in the non-Socialist world[30].

"Psychological warfare," contrary as it is to the generally accepted standards of international relations, has been institutionalized as an official U.S. policy. It became particularly evident in the early '80s when, in an effort to find a way out of the quagmire of a deepening crisis, the strategists of imperialism went all-out to strain international relations and consign to oblivion whatever positive experience there was in developing equal and mutually beneficial cooperation between the nations of the two world systems.

It must be noted that the prosecution of psychological warfare was sanctioned through legislation which Congress passed in 1948, making it part of U.S. national policy[31]. It was at that time, too, that a directive of the National Security Council made it incumbent on the CIA to conduct "psychological operations" along with other "special" actions in respect of the U.S.S.R. A directive of the same Council in 1958 enjoined the CIA "to continue creating problems for 'international Communism' to reduce its strength"[32]. Those and other documents fixed the CIA's leading role as a permanent factor within the structure of institutions engaged in ideological subversion.

The Ukrainian Republic has been one of the targets of that subversion ever since the opening moves of the postwar reorganization of the secret front of imperialism. It was, however, still in war time that a special "study" of questions involving the Ukraine had been undertaken behind the back of the American people who were the Soviet Union's ally in the struggle against the common enemy of humanity — the fascist aggressor. For instance, there was a certain O. Frederiksen, an author of Ukrainian studies, working in the East European division on foreign nationalities in the Office of Strategic Services (the CIA's predecessor). After the war he was offered the job of assistant professor of history at Miami University where he carried on his work along that line[33]. The CIA, which was created in that period, got down to a full-scale study of "ethnic" issues as followed straight from the National Security Council's Directive of June 18, 1948, which called for "aid" to former fascist collaborationists who were called "refugee liberation gropus".

Yet another task that was set at that time was to conduct subversive propaganda by "funding anti-Soviet groups and publications" [34]. Bringing various anti-Soviet organizations into its network, the CIA, as testified by American authors V. Marchetti and J. Marks, "has also been quite active" among those who had come from "Eastern Europe" [35].

Even at the time of the "containment" doctrine, "supporting anti-Soviet or anti-Russian émigrés abroad" was a major CIA activity [36]. In the late '40s, it was already making wide use of Third Reich henchmen, which was in line with their plans for hostile operations against the U.S.S.R. The American secret services acted on the principle that, first, the ideological and political platform of those "refugees" was rabid anti-Sovietism. Second, they acted as individuals "in the know" about the object of imperialist international actions. Third, one important thing about them was their status as bankrupts ready to carry out any assignments, including those of subversion, just to get the means of subsistence and satisfy their reckless ambitions.

Having thereby included the so-called Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and similar groups in the system of psychological warfare, the chiefs of secret services set out to use it for inciting various population groups to hostile action against the social and political system of Socialist countries. All that has been consistent with the CIA reliance on methods borrowed from the stock-in-trade of subversion, like "black propaganda" or disinformation, to mention but two. As the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, Gus Hall has pointed out, "the CIA spends billions of U.S. taxpayers' money on spreading lies and distortions to the people of the United States and throughout the world" [37]. According to what was far from complete information, published by *The New York Times* in 1977, the number of propaganda agencies in the CIA service at a time topped 800 [38]. It should be noted in this context that it is not only the media but student, cultural, educational and other organizations that are used for covert propaganda in perfect agreement with the CIA canons, as its former official Philip Agee has revealed [39]. One distinguishing feature of the propaganda network is that many individuals involved in it, being as they are rank-and-file members of a particular organization, have no direct contact with the CIA and quite often no idea of the secret contact the bosses have with it. But while thinking themselves to be in an "independent" organization, they do serve, as a matter of fact, as a blind instrument to do the bidding of that spy agency.

Inside the CIA, as Philip Agee testified, subversive propaganda is controlled by its major structural subdivision – "clandestine services", officially known as Directorate of Operations and unofficially as Department of Dirty Tricks, with its "regional" divisions. As far as ideological operations against the U.S.S.R. are concerned, they are strictly controlled by the "Soviet Russia" division and the "clandestine services" [40]. The radio mouthpieces of anti-Sovietism, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, are traditionally under the aegis of the Directorate of Operations [41]. These are the units that mastermind anti-Ukrainian activities.

As H. Ranson, the author of a book about the intelligence Establishment, has pointed out, the CIA cooperates with more than 500 universities, colleges, and post-graduate schools with a view to enlisting the services of their staff and graduates for a "study" of the U.S.S.R. and other countries [42]. The CIA, American Professor M. Parenty has said, has been financing the writings of many "independent" scholars [43]. Sovietological institutes and centres whose "research studies" in the field of ideological subversion are used by the intelligence services of the U.S. and other NATO countries in the struggle against the U.S.S.R., have been invited to share in carrying through all kinds of subversion plans.

CIA "specialists" devise the tactics of spreading disinformation and fabricating anti-Soviet "documents." It is they that supply the actual performers of acts of ideological subversion with appropriate instructions, as Morton Halperin, a former aide to the national security adviser, confirmed during hearings in the House Select Committee on Intelligence [44]. At the same time, it is on instructions from the Directorate of Operations that subsidies are issued for organizations and individuals drawn into the propaganda business. For example, it is on orders from the CIA and to earn its "prizes" that Sovietologists have been preparing anti-Soviet "research studies" about the Ukraine for publication in the press of the U.S. and other Western countries.

The products made under CIA plans, are used in the subversive operations of Radio Liberty to sow the seeds of discord among the peoples of the U.S.S.R. One of the CIA secret documents, revealed by Polish intelligence service Captain A. Czechowicz called for the cultivation of enmity between the peoples of the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries, undermining confidence in the U.S.S.R., depicting this country as a neo-imperialist Power, and stirring up chauvinistic prejudice. A directive document, which had been in force at the Radio Liberty headquarters, published by the

Volksstimme newspaper in Vienna, contained an assignment for ideological subversion agents: provoke mistrust of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. towards each other and disrupt their unity by interpreting current events as they see fit [45].

"National" editorial boards of broadcasting stations serve as the organizing structures for these instructions to be put into effect in propaganda work. Within the CIA itself, Radio Liberty is qualified as an organization under control [46].

The CIA-controlled centres specializing in "Ukrainian" subjects also include the Prologue Research and Publishing Corporation founded in New York in 1952, the Smoloskyp Publishing House in Baltimore, to mention just two.

While counting on a widening area of ideological subversion in the context of international détente, American secret services set up an international Research Centre of the Samizdat — Samizdat's record office, in Munich in 1977. Apart from collecting anti-Soviet writings, it was called upon to distribute literature hostile towards Socialism and devise methods of smuggling such publications into Socialist countries. As the West German *Unsere Zeit* newspaper has pointed out, it is the CIA again that is funding the Centre's subversive activity [47]. Its recently established subsidiary has included "Ukrainian" subjects in its programme. A Sovietologist, B. Bociurkiw, a devotee of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), has been put into its sponsoring group.

Lying versions and stereotypes of "Ukrainologists" are being brought into the mainstream of interpretations disseminated by the "Big Press" and also by leading broadcasting and television companies, and publishing houses of Western countries. As V. Marchetti and J. Marks have pointed out, the clandestine services chief was directly "concerned with publicizing anti-Communist émigré groups (many of which were subsidized or organized by the CIA) and he often encouraged reporters to write about their activities" [48].

It is for this reason that the "Big Money Press" of the U.S. and other Western countries has been systematically carrying provocative articles about the Soviet Ukraine — slanted documents and other "fabrications".

The same kind of machinery of organizing "Ukrainological research" operates in the publishing business, as one can see by having a look at the New York F. Praeger firm, which, as its owner has admitted, has produced between 20 and 25 books which the CIA has watched with interest in the writing, publishing and distribution stages [49]. These

books included some that preached anti-Sovietism in "national" wrappings, distorting the history of the Ukraine. In 1973, there was a collection called *The Soviet Economy in Regional Perspective*, edited by University "Ukrainologists", in which one of the "group of contributors" was unequivocally listed as a CIA employee [50].

The propaganda orientation and subversive direction of "Ukrainian studies" under CIA control are determined by various forms of incentives provided to encourage them. The philanthropic corporate funds have a major function to discharge in this respect. A student of their operations, F. Lundberg has produced a rather telling revelation that these funds serve as a field for full-scale activity of the American spy service [51]. At its behest, large sums of money are taken out for anti-Sovieteers as what is claimed to be encouragement of their scientific, educational and other "humanitarian" activities.

The Ford Foundation holds a special place in this system. In conjunction with other similar centres, it has been involved in providing the ideological rationale for the foreign policy precepts of the financial oligarchy and impressing them on the public mind. The community of purposes has been behind the community of attitude of the Ford corporation and the government department to the "study of the Ukrainian Republic". Starting from the '50s, the Ford Foundation and its subsidiary — the East European Fund Inc. have been most prominent in subsidizing "Ukrainological research". As admitted by recipients, the Ford Corporation has begun to set aside "large sums" for "research" and for anti-Communist publications supposedly "in support of Ukrainian culture and science".

In organizing this propaganda, the secret services have reserved a special place also for outcasts from Socialist societies. As American researchers have been pointing out "the CIA has always been interested in reaching and encouraging" these individuals, using émigré groups in Western Europe and the U.S. and "often provide a conduct for the CIA" in its communication with its agents abroad [52].

One of the functions of the U.S. subversion agency in the postwar period has been to train forces for "psychological warfare". Under appropriate plans, stipends have been issued through charity foundations for the would-be "Ukrainologists" who, upon completing their college or university education, join various compartments of the imperialist machinery. Stipends provided by the Ford Foundation were

used, notably, in the '50s and '60s under CIA instructions for this purpose.

So the secret subversive services have emerged as permanent vehicles of the propaganda of national discord and instruments of stimulating appropriate "research" in Western universities and other centres. Although it has more than once been in for bitter disappointment in carrying out its plans in the face of the mounting power of the forces of peace and social progress, imperialism is not, however, considering winding up its undercover operations involving Sovietology.

4. UNDER THE PLANS OF THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX

The military-industrial complex, a sinister alliance of major corporations and the military Establishment, has been exercising a growing influence on the policy of the imperialist State, making it increasingly reactionary and aggressive. The major department representing the interests of this complex, the Pentagon, has been engaged in more than purely military affairs. American historians and politicians note that it is active as a law-maker in matters relating to foreign policy and opinion moulding [53]. In this context, the military Establishment relies on a huge propaganda machinery at work to brainwash different population groups "from schoolchildren and teachers to ranchers and farmers, from union leaders to defence contractors, from boy scouts to American legionaires" I. William Fulbright, who had been in charge of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for quite a long time, emphasized that the military Establishment was imposing the only view for the masses to digest as regards the solution of any social or political problem in the world, the military one: "the use of force" [54].

Anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism are the sum and substance of this activity of the military Establishment. In the very first few months following the end of the war, the U.S. High Command, with Dwight Eisenhower in charge, lost no time in taking under its direct control the anti-Soviet organizations which called themselves Ukrainian and which were in the service of Hitler's Reich during World War II. In 1953, one of the trumpeters of official militarist ideology, Stephan Possony, writing in the U.S. Army magazine, said that "the Ukrainian question will become increasingly more important" for the Pentagon [55].

In that period, the UCCA became the major executant

of the will of the military Establishment from among the former contractors for the Reich, and it was a military intelligence officer, Leo Dobriansky that was put at the head of it. It was also at that time, in 1946, that the new chief made his maiden policy speech at the first postwar Congress of this organization. Introduced to his audience as an "instructor of New York University", he lauded the remaining bands that, with the Nazis driven out, were still at large and on the rampage with support from American and British intelligence services in some Western regions of the Ukraine.

The UCCA, grouping as it did anti-Communist organizations of various complexions, became an instrument whereby the Pentagon was setting in motion the press, broadcasting programmes, publishing houses, and "research" groups which claimed to "know" the history and the current events in the Ukraine. The chiefs of this pseudo-Ukrainian centre have been most zealous in singing along with the military in spreading all stuff and nonsense about "Communist aggression" and seeking to justify the expansionist designs of the military-industrial complex.

The militarists have been trying to "justify" the need for "Ukrainological" wishful thinking by doctrines of "national interests" and "national security" of the United States, which boil down to assuring the objectives of the imperialist bourgeoisie — intervention in the affairs of other nations and peoples. Back in 1956, an American journalist, Edith K. Roosevelt, who was close to conservative circles, referring to CIA and Pentagon sources, revealed plans for intervention in the internal affairs of the Ukrainian and other peoples of the U.S.S.R. so as ... "to prevent an attack on the West"! [56] That line was confirmed, as a matter of fact, by the Republican Party leadership in the 1980 election campaign.

The Pentagon has been spreading distortions about the Ukraine's past and present through its public relations system — all kinds of special lectures and seminars, secret briefings, etc. The National War College is one of the places where such activities go on. It is a place where, as American researchers G. Lyons and L. Morton have pointed out, they are studying geographic regions "of interest" to the United States and providing courses on "Communist nations" [57]. They often invite retired generals, top-ranking officers and other individuals connected with the customers and suppliers of arms and ammunition. "Experts on the Ukraine" are ever present at such gatherings.

The Pentagon has likewise been giving invariable attention to the organizations of members of former bands and the SS *Halichyna* Division, whose overriding concern is to "cultivate the idea of armed struggle" against the Soviet people. American officers and generals address these gatherings as top speakers. So availing themselves of the services of the sworn enemies of the Ukrainian people, the militarists are using them to canvass for young people to join the U.S. Armed Forces. The recruitment takes place in special camps. In this way the Pentagon expects to enlist the services of individuals hostile towards Socialism and so turn the Army into a haven for rightists. This trend is due, above all, to the fact that the U.S. Armed Forces are increasingly involved in operations to "placate" people at home and abroad, that is, discharging outspokenly police functions.

The "ethnic" press is actively used for the recruitment campaign among persons of Ukrainian extraction. It is giving full publicity to certain arms, particularly task forces which train thugs for "behind-the-lines action"; canvass members of anti-Communist organizations for joining the U.S. Army reserve. They are promised, on behalf of Pentagon recruiting officers, to be awarded all kinds of privileges like pay "while on leave" and "while on duty" or the facilities of "cheap military stores".

Newspapers and periodicals appearing under "Ukrainian" titles have been quite zealous in advertising, following the "Big money Press" and other capitalist media, the latest types and systems of deadly weapons which are being designed or phased in by the Pentagon — modernized nuclear-powered submarines, Cruise missiles, neutron bombs, Star Wars system, etc. While praising such weapons to the skies, they present them as a means promising to those who may wish to handle them all kinds of benefits to gain in the struggle against "world Communism". Aiding and abetting this propaganda, the Pentagon has been distributing awards to its helpmates in these "ethnic groups", awarding the title of "honorary recruiter" in recognition of their special zeal. This title has been bestowed, for instance, on W. Gallan, the chief of a special "committee" which was luring young people from American families of Ukrainian origin as mercenaries. Many of them were used as cannon fodder in the U.S. dirty war against the people of Vietnam in the '60s.

To support the programmes of the military-industrial complex, the Pentagon's "gold laces" have been banking on

an alliance with rightist and extreme rightist groups whose participation is based on a secret National Security Council directive (endorsed in May 1958) by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which made the military responsible for brainwashing the public to make it accept the stories about the "Soviet threat" [58]. While the enforcement of that directive was under discussion, the emphasis was made on procuring writings by persons hostile towards Socialist countries.

To direct and finance pro-militarist "education", corporate interests have set up special centres, with the major role played by the American Security Council (ASC) comprising firms that cooperate with the Pentagon. Generals in key positions at the Pentagon were included in the ASC governing bodies alongside representatives of corporate interests.

Following the Pentagon example, the ASC has been availing itself of the services of "experts" on "Ukrainology", meeting notably, in the "National Strategy Staff". The latter is the ASC's "military" department pressing for new nuclear missile programmes and for a "first strike" at the U.S.S.R. The same individuals have been involved in collecting material for "research reports" advocating armed intervention in the internal affairs of other countries supposedly to ensure the U.S. "national interests". One typical piece of writing in this sense has been the *Peace and Freedom Through Cold War Victory* which recommended to the U.S. Government a military strategy worked out by the ASC for a "victory" over Socialist countries.

Under the ASC aegis, corporate interests set up an "Enlightenment Fund" with means to subsidize the workings of "experts on the Ukrainian problem", notably, within the framework of domestic broadcasting programmes. One thing to show what kind of interpretations the military-industrial complex wants its servants to produce has been the broadcast *Détente: Fact and Fiction.* (November 1974). In an attempt to discredit the idea of business cooperation in the international arena, its organizers tried, by pretending to delve into the past, to attribute to the Soviet Union the "aggressiveness" which, they claimed, appeared "as early as" the Civil War and foreign invasion in relation to "non-Russian republics and peoples" [59]. The flunkeys of militarism echo any fake story made for the money from the "Enlightenment Fund" to stir up war jitters. For instance, in 1977, there was a "documentary" film designed to "prove" the argument about the "unending military build-up" of the U.S.S.R. Even *The New York Times,* whose editors have, of

course, no liking for the Soviet Union, had to qualify the ASC film as slanted and designed to intimidate audiences in the U.S. However, the UCCA chiefs, invited for the preview, decided to advertise it and, in that context, to "weigh the importance" of their propaganda efforts.

Similar purposes are served by the "strategy seminars" arranged by the Pentagon and munitions corporations in conjunction with extreme Right organizations. Founded in 1959, under an NSC directive, they were designed to attract individuals in one way or another involved in public opinion moulding, such as journalists and teaching staffs. At the same time, they are supposed to be carried out with the participation of psychological warfare trumpeters who claim to "know" the Ukrainian realities.

In the '60s and '70s fake stories about the situation in the Ukraine began to be more and more often included in the propaganda stock-in-trade by rightist organizations closely connected with the militarists, such as "Young Americans for Freedom", "American Legion", "The John Birch Society", and other centres subsidized by munitions corporations and calling for a "victory over Communism" by all means of struggle.

By their content, the pronouncements of the "Ukrainologists" in the course of "enlightenment" activities invariably coincide with those of the hawks of the Pentagon or extreme Right groups. A conference in Boulder, Colorado, in 1976, on the "policy of détente," heard a falsifier of the history of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, M. Pap of John Carroll University speaking from the same panel with the ex-director of the USIA, F. Shakespeare, General W. Thomson, and other partisans of a "military solution of the contradiction with Communism". He qualified détente as "another phase of the Cold War," just as all militarists used to do.

The Pentagon has been reposing special hopes on brainwashing the direct executants of its sinister plans. This activity has the hallmarks of "propaganda war" which implies, as the historian J. Donovan has found, using various means of withholding disadvantageous — truthful information [60]. In his book, *Politics of Lying*, American researcher D. Wise said that at the Pentagon's Defence Information School, not far from Indianapolis, graduated by close on 2,000 servicemen every year, the students were specially trained "to be slippery" [61].

Integral to U.S. military ideology is the false propaganda slogan "opposition to Communist aggression" [62]. Material

sent to army units is permeated with "theories" and stereo types in the spirit of racism and ethnic animosity.

It is propaganda interests again that have prompted the inclusion of a "study of the Ukraine" in the curricula of military colleges, with the Military Academy in West Point occupying one of the leading places where officers major in "Soviet research" [63]. So, military colleges, picking anti-Soviet publications as textbooks, rely on "private" centres and their publishing facilities. For instance, the Air Force College has organized the reprinting of articles from "Ukrainological" publications in their "monthly reports" which, as admitted by Colonel E. Overholser, "constitute required background reading for all teachers and students at War College" and contain "material that fits our needs" [64]. Publications of this kind are collected also by the Army Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth (Kansas). As one can see from a letter by the Deputy College Chief, General W. Harrison, which appeared in New York in June 1974, the publications about the Ukrainian Republic coming from rightist "ethnic" groups were appreciated as a "source of information for the study of the Soviet Union".

From time to time, military institutions arrange "lectures" by Sovietologists from "private" centres. One delivered at the New York Headquarters of the Naval Reserve Intelligence Division provides a good idea of what they are like. The lecturer, while holding forth about "the history of the Ukraine, the economic and human resources as well as the political aspirations of the Ukrainian people," treated his audience to a hotchpotch of slander based on the ultra-Right allegations about the "captive nations" in the U.S.S.R. Trying to make his listeners keen on the "strategic position" of the Ukraine, he argued that support for such interpretations of life in the Ukraine "could only be in the interest of the United States". He referred in similar terms to the "study" of the Ukraine in the U.S., "the U.S.-Soviet cultural exchange program", and so on. No wonder that the press report of that event should have declared, in a style typical of the militarists, that "the problem of the Ukraine" was "vital" to U.S. defence [65].

While using self-righteous speculation about "national interests" and "national defence" to cover up the demand for "Ukrainological" interpretations, the Pentagon hawks have been presenting it exclusively in the context of imperialism's key propaganda hoax — that of the "Soviet military threat". It is indicative that the first product of this kind by falsifiers of national relations, misrepresenting Soviet policy

towards the nations of Asia and Africa, was introduced as a "textbook" at the National War College in the '50s.

The militaristic aspect of this branch of Sovietology is most clearly seen in the activities the Pentagon has been sponsoring in plotting acts of aggression against Socialist nations and peoples in battle for their liberation. To that end, it is using "Ukrainologists" as "specialists in zonal questions of foreign countries" to teach reserve officers. That is the way it is carrying out the Pentagon directive for enlisting the services of universities and private organizations to train the Army Reserve units. One of the practical objectives of such training is to form an occupation administration which Pentagon strategists have been making up of the top crust of anti-Soviet "ethnic" organizations. "These Reserve units", the Pentagon's yes-men have sympathetically quoted, "are organized and trained to be able, in the event of mobilization, to serve as the command element of civil affairs organization which could govern an occupied country or group of countries" [66]. That is the concern of the Transatlantic "enthusiasts" of the history of the Ukraine — the preparation for an armed invasion of sovereign States.

The inclusion of "Ukrainian" topics into warmongering ideology is an indication that anti-Sovietism and anti-Communism have been turned into an instrument by which to spur on the arms race and bring pressure to bear on public opinion in the West, that is, an instrument of fighting not only the Communists, but all democrats and patriots opposed to war. The emphasis on ethnic intolerance to whip up military psychosis rests on the common ideological precepts of reactionary nationalism and militarism — the preaching of enmity and hatred for "alien" peoples and nations and, accordingly, the cultivation of the spirit of violence and aggression. Trying to back up the "Soviet threat" hoax by wishful thinking about the "Russian-dominated" Ukraine is the objective behind the interest that the military Establishment takes in Sovietology. As the General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A., Gus Hall once pointed out in New York, "our country does, indeed, face a serious danger, but it does not come from the Soviet Union. The source of danger to this country is here, in this country itself, in the White House and in the Pentagon" [67].

* * *

The record of the postwar period shows that imperialism has been placing its social order for the fabrication of biassed concepts on the various aspects of the current de-

velopment and history of the Ukrainian Republic with its own advocates who are expected to operate as supposedly independent ethnic Ukrainians and their organizations, while presenting "Ukrainological" inerpretations as being consistent with the "national interests" of the United States.

In trying to sell "Ukrainology" as a catalyst of anti-Sovietism to stir up dissent in Socialist countries and mislead the anti-imperialist movement, the top leadership is seeking to infect the masses with the lie that hostility for the Soviet Union and for Socialism in general is an indispensable component of the national interest of any particular people and their country.

So, the ward politicians want the anti-Soviet interpretations of the past and present of the Ukrainian Republic to play their part in conducting a course that is fraught with a serious danger to the cause of peace and social progress of humanity. The foregoing material attests to the great urgency today of exposing the ideology and politics of national alienation and conflicts which imperialist reaction counts on in blocking every effort to resolve the burning problem of our times — the problem of war and peace.

Chapter II

"UKRAINIAN STUDIES": CENTRES AND THEIR PURPOSES

To push their political doctrines, the imperialist élite in power has been trying to back them up with concepts and theories from contemporary Western historiography. That is, properly speaking, what accounts for numerous attempts at presenting the latter as a kind of repository of objective knowledge. There are some reasons behind such a presentation. It was back last century that some essential change occurred in the options of bourgeois historiography. Engels was one of the first to notice it. In his work *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, he pointed out a distinguishing feature of bourgeois historical science — the disappearance of the spirit of free investigation. "Inane eclectism" he wrote, "and an anxious concern for career and income, descending to the most vulgar job-hunting, occupy its place. The official representatives of these sciences have become the undisguised ideologists of the bourgeoisie and the existing State — but at a time when both stand in open antagonism to the working class" [1].

In the present-day conditions, the financial and military-political oligarchy, opposing the interests not only of the working class, but of the largest mass of the people as well, has a yet greater reason to disguise those who act as its ideological standard-bearers.

1. INTEGRATION OF NAZI OSTFORSCHERS

The activities of a whole series of exponents of Western social sciences attest to further changes in monopoly-dominated historiography. Imperialist elements consider that the greatest benefit they can derive from the employment of their ideological defenders is in specialized centres. The years that followed right after the Second World War saw quite a proliferation of such organizations, especially, those directly charged with "elaborating" the problems of the history of Socialist society, above all, that of the Soviet

Union. There emerged a special kind of industry, Sovietology, incorporating institutes, chairs, societies, government and propaganda departments.

Sovietology developed by leaps and bounds in the U.S. as a system from 1946 on under plans hatched by reactionary elements while the war was still going on. At that time, according to the American Joint Committee for Slavic Research, the government and universities which "urgently needed" experts on Soviet affairs concentrated their efforts on "meeting these immediate needs" [2]. The first Sovietological centre to have been inaugurated after the war in the United States — the Russian Institute at Columbia University — was opened at the behest of the Office of Strategic Services (military intelligence) which directed the "study" of the U.S.S.R. by the spurious principle of "Soviet expansionism".

The establishment of Sovietological facilities had its imprint, too, on the formation of a system of "Ukrainian studies" with emphasis, right from the outset, on the idea of attracting members of the staff of "research" centres which had functioned in the Nazi Reich [3]. Many of the Nazi "Ukrainologists" had found themselves by the end of the war among the "refugees" and "displaced persons" (DPs) who had settled in the Western zones of Germany and Austria.

Reliance on the former Reich officials and collaborationists was due, notably, to a programme drawn up by military services, including intelligence [4]. The need to use "exiles" for "effective anti-Communist political war" in view of a shortage of home-grown adepts was indicated by an ideologue of U.S. imperialism James Burnham in the very opening stages of the Cold War [5]. Many of them were former fascist Ostforschers who only had a certain amount of professional knowledge, but were versed in anti-Soviet propaganda methods as well. Those individuals had worked both before and during the war, in offices in the territory of Germany, Czechoslovakia and Poland which were serving the expansionist policy of imperialism as a whole, above all, its strike force — German fascism. Their job was to fit their "studies" of the history, economies and mentality of the peoples, including the Ukrainians, to the predatory ambitions of the Hitler clique and to the subjugation of the residents of the occupied territories.

Among the centres which were "studying" Ukraine under the programmes of the intelligence services, Wehrmacht, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and other services of the

Third Reich, there were the Berlin Ukrainian Scientific Institute, the Institute of Eastern Europe in Breslau, the Economic Institute of Russia and Eastern Countries in Königsberg, the Berlin and Königsberg Universities, the Ukrainian Scientific Institute in Warsaw, the Ukrainian Free University in Prague, to mention just a few [6].

While hiring former Nazi "specialists", the new employers had to resort to camouflage, considering the hatred of the great mass of people for fascism and everything that went with it. In the opening stages, the Nazi "Ukrainologists" were invited to serve with "private" organizations whose activities were determined by "cultural and scholarly purposes" and maintained by official institutions, because DP organizations which claimed to be political, "aroused the suspicion of moderate and liberal opinion" [7].

The Ukrainian Free University (UFU) resumed its activities in Munich as early as November, 1945 under its former name with the cooperation of the U.S. occupation authorities. The Shevchenko Scientific Society (SSS) and a number of other organizations appeared in West Germany in 1947. Seeking admission to American and other centres of bourgeois science, the adepts of fascist Ostforschung laid themselves out to "prove" their membership of the "free world" and their allegiance to "Western democracy".

Anti-Communism, institutionalized by the Truman Administration as an official policy to further the U.S. supremacy-seeking ambitions throughout the world, had a most decisive effect on the political orientation of "Ukrainology" as it was developed in America. Its priorities were to join the general crusade of reactionary forces against anti-fascist opinion, against the sympathy that the world's working people had for the Soviet Union, which made the major contribution towards smashing up Hitler Germany. What frightened anti-Communists, in particular, was that the keen interest in the life of the Soviet people was logically prompting questions about the reasons for the victory of the Soviet people, that is, the social, economic and political sources of that historic achievement. A growing number of people were coming to realize that it was the advanced Socialist system, the ideology of humanism and social progress that had won the battle against Nazism.

In the course of the war, even the bourgeois press and radio of the United States had to report the heroic struggle of the Soviet Union. But it was the organizations most active in promoting friendship and cooperation with the U.S.S.R. that played the major part in bringing truthful information

home to the people of their respective countries. Neither did the Ukrainian working people in exile stay out of that movement. One direct manifestation of their solidarity with the Soviet people during the Great Patriotic War was their material aid. According to incomplete statistics, Ukrainian-born Americans had raised about 250,000 dollars [8]. A solidarity movement developed in Canada, collecting over 500,000 dollars, over 120 tons of clothing, and other things [9]. Aid the Native Land Committees were set up in various countries of Latin America, with Ukrainian emigrants most active in them.

Interest in the Soviet Union found expression in historical research, too. Some bourgeois authors had to acknowledge the impact that the Soviet peoples' great victory in the Second World War had on public opinion in foreign countries. For instance, G. Vernadsky pointed out in his monograph *The History of Russia* that the ever-growing general interest around the world in the U.S.S.R. had been one of the motives that prompted him to start writing it, in the first place [10].

Setting course for a confrontation with the Soviet Union, the imperialists launched a frantic attack against positive judgements about our country. A full-scale offensive got under way in the West against democratic forces and organizations and special legislation and administrative acts were passed. In the U.S. this campaign was associated with the appearance of Senator Joseph McCarthy — trumpeter of belligerent anti-Communism — on the political stage. The spread of McCarthyism brought with it an unprecedented suppression of civil liberties. Even Walter Lippmann, a sociologist and political journalist, who had not the slightest sympathy for progressive movements, was forced to qualify the offensive of McCarthyism at a later date as "one of the great national tragedies" of the United States. "The damage that was done was very great," he wrote. "It was done in the kind of thinking" [11].

To check "dissent" at home, the contingent of professional anti-Communists was reinforced by importing them from abroad. Such "imports" were facilitated by the immigration Acts passed by the U.S. Congress, which allowed "displaced persons" to enter the American mainland. On their arrival, the DPs were to sign a statement under oath to confirm their anti-Communist outlook. Secret services were granted the right to intervene in immigration matters — a review of the immigrant's past record, which was prescribed by the Internal Security Act of September 23, 1950. Still earlier,

under the Act of June 20, 1949, the CIA was allowed to bring in the men it needed every year as immigrants. Such a practice took place in Canada, too, where the official policy of stepping up reactionary propaganda against the U.S.S.R. and labour organizations of Canada was one of the motives to explain permission for fascist collaborationists to enter that country.

In a climate of actual encouragement of anti-Sovieteers, easy terms of entry into the U.S. and Canada were granted to former Nazi henchmen, disguised, notably, as "scientists" or "writers". One of such "scientists" was R. Smal-Stocki who had been in the Offenbach camp. As the Ukrainian-language newspaper, *Ukrainski shchodenni visti* of New York reported on January 15, 1946, he was "dreaming of creating a military vanguard with a counter-intelligence mission. His main stake is on an 'eventuality' of war between the United States and the Soviet Union".

A Cultural Wanderers Relief Committee was set up in New York early in 1946 to support Hitler's menials on the run. It was formed of reactionary-minded professors and intelligence service agents. The Committee's job was to help arrange for "Ukrainologists" from "displaced persons" camps in West Germany and Austria to immigrate to America. In the first few months of its operation, it provided 150 individuals with appropriate documents. Upon its request, 25 Ukrainian quislings, including Nazi staffers, were transported across the Atlantic for the money of the American Christian Committee for Refugees. The entry of all those immigrants was sanctioned by the FBI, State Department and other services. Besides, facilities were provided for entire anti-Communist organizations, operating behind scientific signboards, to be moved to America. The DPs, once in America, joined the campaign against the members of the public accused by McCarthyists and other reactionaries of "disloyalty".

The area that underwent a particular upheaval was Slavonic research which dealt with the subjects concerning the history and present development of the U.S.S.R. Among the masterminds behind the reactionary politicizing of American Slavonic studies was the director of the Russian Institute at Columbia University, Philip Mosely who was concerned with rallying former fascist Ostforschers in the United States. Speaking of the situation that was developing in American social sciences at the time, American researchers R. Ellsworth and S. Harris named a number of professors, including the "experts on the Ukraine" R. Smal-Stocki and

W. Chamberlin who openly identified themselves with the Right movement in the U.S.[12] The adepts of "Ukrainology' were infuriated on finding some scholars concerned with historiography in the U.S., Canada and Britain recognizing and citing in their works certain facts attesting to the indisputable achievements of the nationalities policy of the CPSU. The conclusions those researchers arrived at were clearly at variance with the objectives of anti-Soviet campaigns, and their organizers and protagonists tried to vilify those who attempted to preserve at least a modicum of objectivity in science. For example, one DP, J. Lawrynenko, the man who, on arrival in the U.S., compiled a bibliography on the Ukraine, published in 1953, "warned" the Americans in its preface about a E. Carr who in his monographs "often follows official Soviet interpretation" [13].

Americanized flunkeys of the Reich were used to key up anti-Communist overtones not only in historiography, but also in propaganda to scare the public. Some of them maintained direct contact with the official authorities engaged in persecuting dissident Americans. Former Nazi hirelings had the example of their patrons to emulate. For instance, Professor of Political Science A. Bouscaren of Les Moynes College, member of the editorial board of the *Ukrainian Quarterly*, appearing in New York, combined his pseudo-scientific investigations with his involvement in extremist campaigns and with the fulfilment, notably in 1957-1959, of the functions of an official consultant of the archreactionary Committee on Un-American Activities [14]. Along with other hirelings, the "Ukrainologists" were preaching the spurious idea that it was impossible to establish normal relations with the Socialist countries and supported the concept of an inevitable international armed conflict. In this context, historiography was infected with slanderous assertions about the Soviet State "persisting" with the imperialist foreign policy of the Russian autocracy. In so doing, the new-fangled "experts" passed over the historical facts that the establishment of the Soviet system of State power in Russia put an end to the policy of Czarism and that the very first legislative Act of the Soviet Government — the Decree on Peace — embodied the fundamental principles of a new, Socialist type of foreign policy. Anti-Communists would not admit that Lenin's Decree on Peace had qualified imperialist war as "the greatest crime against humanity" and that at its inception, the Soviet State had openly and honestly declared that it denounced the practice of violence and annexation in international relations and spoke up for good-neighbourly

relations with all countries [15]. The falsifiers did not mention at all that the U.S.S.R., following Lenin's principles, has invariably acted and does act as the standard-bearer in the struggle against aggression and for a lasting peace.

In the context of a reactionary offensive, the anti-Sovieteers were used for purging bourgeois Slavonic studies of all interpretations and evaluations that could in one way or another support the idea of constructive co-operation between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. As testified by an eye-witness of the McCarthyist outrage, William A. Williams, Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin, the climate that it produced in the U.S. made it just about certain for anyone admitting the possibility of negotiations with the U.S.S.R. to be suspected of disloyalty to their own government [16].

There was a full-scale crackdown on the policy that was pursued in war time by the Administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, when the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. had practically developed co-operation and the peoples of the world had ample evidence before them to see the possibility of normal relations between countries with different social systems. The former Nazi "experts" were particularly keen on pandering to the Sovietologists who had set out to rewrite the history of American-Soviet co-operation from McCarthyist positions. They saw their involvement in the smear campaign against the foreign policy of the Roosevelt Administration during the war against Nazi Germany as a way to whitewash their record of service to the Reich and were cynical enough to call the fact that the Western nations — parties to the anti-Hitler coalition — were allies of the U.S.S.R. during World War II a "misunderstanding." Such pronouncements were couched in terms of extreme Right insinuations accusing President Roosevelt, Harriman and other partisans of co-operation with the Soviet Union of having "betrayed the nation's first principles" [17].

McCarthyist hatred for the very idea of co-operation between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. was one of the trends in subsequent "Ukrainological" publications. In a treatise *Ukrainian Historical Science*, published in Philadelphia in 1971, N. Chubaty blamed Roosevelt for having fostered affection for the Soviets among the Western scientific community because he had "recognized the U.S.S.R. in 1933". The McCarthyist stock-in-trade continued to be used against Western historians who have been trying to do some independent research, unaffected by the imperialist stereotyped theories of the "aggressiveness" of the U.S.S.R. For example, N. Chi-

rovsky of Seton-Hall University tried to scare the scientific community with his allegations that Russian history has been interpreted under "political pressure from the Kremlin" and that such interpretations "have been accepted by many Western historians" [18].

That is to say that "Ukrainology" has developed in the West throughout the postwar period by military and other government services, using the transformed Nazi machinery of the "study of the Ukraine". That has become a sinister paradox of American history: the pernicious arsenal of the Reich, defeated by force of arms, was being brought back to life in a country that had been in the anti-Hitler coalition.

2. PENTAGON PRINCIPLES: AREA PROGRAMMES

Tailoring bourgeois "Ukrainology" to the objectives of American imperialism determined the principles of organization of the "studies". These have been borrowed from the military field and, by and large, carbon-copied the methods that were applied in Nazi Ostforschung which built the "study of the Ukraine" with a view to assuring the military plans and applying a utilitarian approach to the selection of data concerning geography, economics, and history.

A similar experience of the "study" of foreign countries had been gained by the U.S. during the Second World War and first included in the courses of the Navy Language School at Boulder, Colorado, and the Army Specialized Training Program [19]. The term "area studies" was applied there to denote a bank of information about a specified region in connection with American military plans.

From 1945 on, the principles of organization of area research were transported into U.S. university Sovietology [20]. The number of "area programmes" jumped from five in 1951 to eigthy in 1971 [21]. Let me note that it is the same military quarters that acted as the initiators of the introduction of area programmes at universities. As noted in a State Department report, the area programmes on the U.S.S.R. were "a result of the recognized military and international needs" of the U.S.[22] Transplanting military methods into the ideological field made for greater interest in such "programmes" also by the services engaged in propaganda within the framework of "psychological warfare," which considers "the area expert" to be an "ideal" one because he is in possession of certain knowledge of "the psychology of the people of the country" which is the object of that propaganda [23].

Area research on the U.S.S.R. or Russian studies implied, at their very origin, a "study" of both the country as a whole and its inidividual regions in particular, treated, notably as "non-Russian areas of the Soviet Union"[24]. This trend was developed along with traditional academic programmes on history, law and literature and other disciplines. However, "area research" came to prominence as a way to attain the objectives of imperialist services.

In "Ukrainology", the "area" system meant, first and foremost, training people to work on Ukrainian-language material. Such programmes reserved a certain place to the Ukrainian language and to Ukrainian letters and history as disciplines to go with it. The object was by no means to learn the wealth of Ukrainian cultural heritage, but to supply the Sovietologists with a certain amount of knowledge about a people regarded as one of the objects of the aggressive policies of imperialism. The money to run such courses with was taken out of annual appropriations (100 million dollars) under the "Mutual Security Act" which was used to finance activities required in the employment of "displaced persons" in the military, ideological and scientific fields.

No wonder that it is the military academic institutions that were the first to start providing instruction in Ukrainian. For example, B. Alexander was hired in February 1953 as a teacher at the Army Language School in Monterey, which trained American officers, and two years later, it opened a "Ukrainian division" with some DPs from among Nazi henchmen as its instructors. Apart from the language, it "taught" the history of the Ukraine. The chief of the division, Alexander, noted in an interview that on graduation, the students of that school got appointments to serve with military missions and also with "several special units in the U.S. Army... in order to be prepared for possible war-time tactical operations"[25]. The school compiled military dictionaries — English-Ukrainian and Ukrainian-English. The Pentagon strategists really carbon-copied fascist Ostforschung which had its centres producing German-Ukrainian dictionaries and other materials for various Third Reich services.

In the mid-1950s, "Ukrainological" courses formed part of the curricula of nine universities in the U.S. The American-Slavic journal emphasized the "utilitarian orientation" of Sovietological programmes connected with "possible military or governmental service" of persons who studied under them[26].

A further impetus to training an anti-Soviet type of "ex-

perts" was given by the "National Defence Education Act" adopted in 1958. It brought the curricula into a closer relationship with military priorities. More of the national Budget was set aside for expanding instruction in mathematics, natural sciences, and foreign languages at universities and colleges and for scholarship grant payments. During the first ten years it was in force, more than 10,000 people received government subsidies to study 90 foreign languages[27].

To realize the objectives under the Act, a group of American Sovietologists in 1959 urged that "more attention should" be given to other languages spoken in the U.S.S.R., along with the Russian[28]. Many of them were classed as "strategical", that is, of interest to the U.S. foreign policy priorities. The Ukrainian language was one of them. For instance, Congressman J. Brademas, speaking at an annual assembly of the Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association at the University of Valparaiso in April, 1959, linked the necessity of studying the Ukrainian and some other languages up with assuring the implementation of the U.S. military-political programmes[29].

Some universities, to attract individuals from immigrant families, established contact with anti-Soviet organizations by canvassing for them through the press. The Ukrainian language, in accordance with the 1958 Act, was included in the curriculum of Syracuse University which had foreign languages taught under the U.S. Armed Forces' plan. Students got stipends and other privileges and benefits provided they took an anti-Communist oath of "loyalty". At the same time, the organizers of the curriculum got down to picking teachers having direct connections with the military Establishment. An instructor from the Pentagon's Monterey School was transferred to Syracuse University as a teacher of Ukrainian. The University of Pennsylvania was one of the first to get subsidies under the 1958 Act to promote "Ukrainology". A total of 118,000 dollars were appropriated in 1964 for it to run courses in ten foreign languages, including the Ukrainian, and for scholarship grants. On the whole, the "Defence Education Act" made it possible to expand the training of "Ukrainologists" for the military and propaganda services within the first five years.

The military orientation of Ukrainian language courses and the disciplines that were taught along with it became particularly evident upon the establishment of special forces within the U.S. Armed Forces, known as "Green Berets", the contingents that were intended for subversive action against Socialist countries and also against peoples enga-

ged in national liberation struggles. These contingents incorporated some commandos trained for behind-the-line operations in the countries concerned. For example, the units of the 10th group of the "Green Berets", deployed in West Germany, have been trained for action on the territory of East European Socialist countries and in the Western regions of the U.S.S.R. There are some "Ukrainian" detachments among those "national commandos." They have been trained for sabotage operations and "psychological warfare" against the local population and the probable enemy armies. Each commando of "Green Berets" has also included a "specialist" for subversive propaganda and rumour-mongering. In 1982, the U.S. Administration ordered a "galvanization" of contingents intended for behind-the-line operations. The backbone of these forces, The *Washington Post* stated, consisted of army units studying, while training, the languages of the Warsaw Pact countries and practising sabotage tactics and subversive operations [30].

The individuals picked to serve with those special contingents are people familiar with the local situation and customs, above all defectors, traitors, and members of immigrant families. One of the conditions they had to meet to make themselves eligible for service with subversion groups was a command of the local language.

In the '70s, instruction in "Ukrainological" subjects under the "area programmes" continued to expand. At universities, those would-be "specialists" were not only getting specified professional training, but undergoing ideological indoctrination both in and outside class-room instruction. The long since bankrupt and historically condemned argument of counter-revolutionaries about a Ukraine "free from Communist domination" is, for example, one of the leading precepts in the "education" of Pentagon "Ukrainologists." In universities, a similar task has been entrusted to student clubs and associations. Yet the efforts expended produce inadequate results. More and more of young people reject the stereotypes of this propaganda. This shows that even those specially selected groups are coming to grasp more and more the unseemly role of the kind of "science" which young Americans and Canadians are called upon to serve. It is becoming just as obvious that it is not any convictions, but material considerations, like scholarship grants and highly-paid work after graduation, that serve as an incentive to attract youngsters into the system of militarized "area research".

The purpose that imperialist elements set in the immediate post-war years was, by taking advantage of the asset of the fascist Ostforschung, to reproduce the machinery of "Ukrainian studies" on American soil, to develop the training of fresh forces and to prepare appropriate publications. It is the system of bourgeois academic activity that served to work out and set in motion the machinery of planning and coordinating such "research."

The first centre of this kind was the Russian Institute at Columbia University with Philip Mosely, former chief of the State Department's Territorial Research Division, as the maker of the programme for the "study" of the U.S.S.R. and East European countries. It was under his direct control that a project for the "study" of the recent history of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was drawn up there. It should be noted, above all, that the masterminds behind that plan were keen on aspects connected with the activities of the exploitative classes overthrown in the Ukraine. A seminar on "Russian foreign policy", directed by Philip Mosely, for instance, suggested an apologetic "study" that was made subsequently about the bourgeois nationalistic counter-revolution in the Ukraine in 1917-1918 [31].

A plan to "study the Ukraine", consisting of three parts covering 1917-1920, 1920-1939, and 1939-1945 respectively, was drawn up on Mosely's proposal in the late '40s. It is indicative that only the first and the third parts of that plan were carried out in the '50s, that is, those that "studied" the periods of hostilities in the Ukrainian lands, which responded to the aggressive strategy of the Cold War policy the U.S. Administration conducted in respect of the Soviet Union. These "studies" were used as the starting point to produce monographs by J. Reshetar and J. Armstrong in 1952 and 1955 [32]. The object that the executants of the Mosely plan had to fulfil was to identify the possibilities of exploiting ethnic enmity in the course of the hostilities of imperialist States against the U.S.S.R. "A major purpose of this study has been to inquire," J. Armstrong wrote, "whether Ukrainian nationalism possessed the potentiality of arousing such emotions (meaning activities to cultivate enmity towards other peoples — Ed.) and to determine the circumstances under which such potentiality, if it existed, could become a reality" [33] Accordingly, the author made a meticulous stock-taking of the "extremist actions" of the ounists in the service of Nazi Germany and tried to indicate the

ways of "galvanizing" their activities in post-war conditions. It is by no means a matter of chance that the main source of the "material" used for his treatise was the information supplied by former Third Reich flunkeys, carried out under American intelligence plans. In his turn, J. Reshetar devoted a whole chapter of his treatise to bringing out the role of bourgeois emigrants in the struggle against the establishment of the Soviet system of government in the Ukraine [34].

The "Ukrainian studies" were most closely linked up with the concrete plans of military and secret services. For example, material on the "Ukrainian issue" was used in one of the reports compiled by a group of Sovietologists in the early 1950s on orders from the Psychological Warfare Division of the U.S. Air Force which wanted an "inquiry" into the partisan movement in Nazi-occupied Soviet territory for its current "research." The "findings" were passed on, under the contract, to the customer and only part of that material, edited by J. Armstrong and prefaced by Mosely, was published as a monograph ten years later to reinforce the propaganda front of anti-Sovietism [35]. Yet another sign to prove that the "study" of the history of the U.S.S.R. was designed to meet the interests of the elements that were dead-set, above all, on a military-political confrontation was the unambiguous statement by one of the organizers of "Ukrainian studies" in the U.S., C. Manning, in the '50s that "any objective study of the Communist-dominated world is rendered impossible, if the supplemental goal is to promote mutual understanding" [36].

In the '60s, '70s and in the early half of the '80s, the advocacy of the "struggle of nations" disguised as a study of the Ukraine was made yet more integral to Sovietology. True, the outward aspect of these "studies" underwent certain change: their authors were more careful in disguising the political considerations behind their publications, trying to avoid rhetoric which became widespread at the height of the Cold War. Yet, the objectives were the same — hostility towards Socialism as a social and political system.

In their effort to advertise more misinterpretations of national relations, specialists from the Russian Institute turned to the Ukraine's history before the October Revolution, as one could see from the doctoral dissertation of R. Elwood "Russian Social Democracy in the Underground: A Study of the RSDRP in the Ukraine, 1907-1914", produced with subsidies from the Ford Foundation and other organizations. It is indicative that the inferences he made in it by no means followed from the problem as he raised and

as he actually put it, but were in crying contrast with the facts of history which, naturally, had no room left for them in that copious work. Its whole object was to treat Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism, without any evidence to prove it, as a certain base of "popular support" for the activities of any political party in the Ukraine[37]. Let me add that even some of the Western historians showed their mistrust in the method used by that author — one of proclaiming his suppositions rather than proving them. For instance, B. Weinryb of Harvard University did point out, if hesitantly, in the American Historical Association's journal that a number of arguments of that book "has little or no basis in fact"[38].

"Ukrainian studies" at Columbia University were stepped up following the launching of a "study" of the nationalities of the U.S.S.R. in 1970, with subsidies of the Ford Foundation, which was built on the "area" principle and geared to the objectives of political propaganda. The men behind it set about "substantiating" the far-fetched argument about the identity of the character of national relations in Socialist and capitalist countries and refurbishing the threadbare dogma of reactionary historiography about contemporary world development as the "age of struggle between nations". Mud-slinging at Socialism was designed to disarm, ideologically, fighters for national and racial equality in the U.S. and in other Western countries so as to damp down the intensity of internal tension which the capitalist world experienced because of national and racial conflicts. Among those in the forefront to carry through this programme were the Sovietologists who distorted over and over again the essence and meaning of the Leninist ethnic relations policy as it was conducted in the Ukraine — Z. Brzezinski, H. Kohn, E. Allworth. A "study" of the "role of the Ukrainians and Byelorussians within the system of the U.S.S.R." began under the said programme in 1974. It had as its key note the argument, borrowed from fugitive counter-revolutionaries about a "Russification of non-Russian peoples", with emphasis on misrepresenting the essence of the new historical community — the Soviet nation.

Next to Columbia University as a focus of "Ukrainian studies" was Harvard University which saw them emerge along with the institution of a Russian Research Centre and the so-called "Harvard Project," that is, a poll of displaced persons" under a U.S. Air Force intelligence programme. The University's special commission went to West Germany to gather biassed information, notably about the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. J. Reshetar, who compiled a con-

fidential report known as "The Nationality Problem in the Soviet Union," was involved in that project in 1950-1951 [39].

In the '70s, Harvard University came forward as the head office engaged in "Ukrainian studies" in the U.S. For it now had a specialized division within its framework — the so-called Ukrainian Research Institute (URI). That venture betrayed the attempts to give Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism, disraceful as it was in its normal appearance even by the standards of Western science, a new "respectable" image as something like a repository of academic knowledge about the Ukraine.

The form that was suggested for the organization of this line of research was the so-called inter-disciplinary approach which made it turn on historiography, history of literature and linguistics [40]. In its sum and substance, that was a variation of the "area programmes" I referred to earlier on.

A special scholarship fund deriving its resources from undisclosed quarters, has been set up to stimulate "research". Subsidies have been offered to Sovietologists of various universities of the U.S. and Canada. Active contributors to anti-Soviet "ethnic" newspapers also have stipends awarded to them as encouragement of their "research effort".

In a bid to make the institute look attractive, its organizers claimed it was engaged in "pure science" only. The Permanent Seminar in Ukrainian Studies was advertised as "a school of methodology in scholarship... a forum for the exchange of scholarly experience and information" [41]. Studies of the Ukraine's pre-Revolution history with a considerable attention given to the Ukrainian Cossack community, made sometimes from objectivistic positions, are presented as a case of "pure science." Several books of commented sources on the history of the Ukraine have been produced in English under the URI auspices. However, most prominent among the monographs have been the reprintings of publications by falsifiers. In its "research" on the post-October Revolution period, the Institute has been indulging in undisguised anti-Soviet insinuations, trying to thrust them on whoever might turn, above all, to the postwar history of the Ukraine.

Members of the Institute's staff are directly involved in propaganda campaigns, attempting, notably, to "justify historically" the outcries of the opponents of détente under the slogan of "human rights defence" and calling, in that context, for pressure to be brought to bear on the U.S.S.R. so as "to organize Western public opinion through all channels of communication (such as the press, radio, personal contact,

official meetings)" [42]. One of the members of the University Ukrainian Studies Committee, R. Pipes has been laying himself out to promote all kinds of activities by American "hawks" to speed up the arms race and wreck international détente, spreading "Soviet threat" stories on behalf of an organization of the military-industrial complex — "The Committee on the Present Danger", and has been active in drawing up "estimates", on Pentagon orders, to justify a swelling U.S. military budget.

Committed to this kind of "research", the Institute has been cooperating with regional research centres within the Harvard University system and sponsoring conferences... The first conference on the subject of "The Ukraine within the U.S.S.R.: An Economic Balance Sheet" met in September, 1974. It was held with financial support from the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies [43]. The figures and mathematical formulas in conference proceedings were based on distortions and substitution of false presumptions for the true premises. Unable to dismiss the Ukraine's obvious economic achievements altogether, P. Wiles of the London School of Economists, H. Hunter of Haverford College, J. Gillula of Duke University, to mention just a few, attempted to play them down at least. One could hardly expect those licensed Sovietologists to follow any different approach, still less so since the Harvard conference demonstrated a new twist in the organization of "Ukrainian research" and the men who did it represented also the organizations that ordered that kind of "research." According to a reference note that has been published, among those who represented "pure science" we can see D. Bronson and F. Whitehouse characterized as "senior research economists", with the CIA mentioned as their place of service. The subject of their paper was the Ukraine's "manpower resources" and the conclusions were definitely biassed [44].

The CIA, the Pentagon, the State Department and other departments "concerned" have been using various forms of organization of Western academic science to get "Ukrainian studies" included in university curricula. It is the traditional Slavic programmes that have become a haven, first and foremost, for those who accept to re-write the history, past and present, of the Ukrainian Republic, alleging it to have been one of unending confrontation between the Ukrainians and the Russians. For example, T. Mackiw got down to interpreting Ukrainian history under feudalism at the University of Acron in the '60s. One piece of his writing that is sufficient to provide an idea of what it is like is his book

about hetman Mazepa, eulogizing that traitor to the Ukrainian people [45]. It came as a certain encouragement of that kind of research when its author was appointed to head a department "for the study of the Soviet Union" organized at that University in 1971.

In the Cold War days, the "Ukrainologists" also became involved in the curricula of the University of Pennsylvania. J. Reshetar was employed as a consultant of its institute of foreign policy research, directed by a notorious propagandist of aggressive anti-Soviet strategy, R. Strausz-Hupé, in the '50s [46]. "Ukrainological" courses are run within the framework of Slavic studies at that University at regular intervals supposedly to meet the wishes of the local American Ukrainian community.

The University of Chicago, one of the first centres for the "area instruction" of the U.S. Army, has also come to be listed among those engaged in "Ukrainian studies." These are conducted within the framework of a Slavic research programme subsidized under the National Defence Education Act as well as by the Ford Foundation. It is investigating, in particular, "ethnic and national relations" and other subjects connected with the history of the U.S.S.R.[47]

One pointer to the military orientation of "Ukrainian studies" on economic problems is the inclusion in their plans of the RAND Corporation working on Pentagon orders. Social scientists are employed there, as B. Smith, a student of RAND activities, states, for "military planning" [48].

Among the U.S. clerical institutions of higher learning, one should note the Catholic University of America in Washington, which offered refuge to former Nazi Ostforschers in the late '40s and also Loyola University in Chicago. One of the functions the Washington clericals assumed is to disseminate disinformation about the position of the Church and religion in the Ukraine. They are using background articles of Catholic encyclopaedical publications to that end. In their turn, the clerical "enlighteners" from Chicago have set out to distribute similar material when they hold "mini-courses" for the "general public" both in the U.S. and in Western Europe. For instance, V. Markus, the author of falsifying treatises about the Ukraine, couched in Cold War terms, has travelled to Italy to deliver "lectures" on history so as to equip certain elements of the Christian Democratic Party with "arguments" in their opposition to the involvement of the Left forces in national government.

Another clerical centre, J. Carroll University spawned an Institute for Soviet and East European Studies in the

early '60s to serve as cover for intelligence activities. It is financed by a number of industrial corporations of Cleveland, the home of the University, through the Cleveland Fund they have established. The Institute is directed by M. Pap, the author of publications presenting the history of the Ukrainian people to the Western readership as a standard extreme rightist portrayal of the "captive" Socialist nations. This kind of "knowledge", notably, of the Ukrainian Republic, is thrust upon prospective American teachers as well as those engaged in doctoral research on inter-community relations in Socialist countries. It is indicative that the academic process, built as it is in terms of enmity for other peoples, has been carried on in close association with the current propaganda campaigns of the U.S. ruling Establishment.

The Zionist elements that came forward in the post-war period as a strike force of imperialist reaction did much to develop the system of "Ukrainian studies". It is generously financing subversion centres that produce anti-Soviet "theories." Anti-Soviet propagandists from among the Nazi Reich henchmen began to be aided and abetted by Zionist elements in the very opening stages of the Cold War. They were enrolled at American research institutions in those years with direct approval by the ringleaders of Zionism. A "Jewish-Ukrainian Commission" was organized in the U.S. in 1952 to work out "plans" for joint activities. One of its priorities was to seek a "scientific" justification of an alliance of Zionists and anti-Semites on the grounds of the politics and propaganda of anti-Sovietism. Pseudo-scientific publications began to be filled with features advocating the community of their ideology and activity and their joint action against the Socialist revolution in the Ukraine and its gains. There was a growing trend to gloss over the anti-Semitic activity of Ukrainian quislings in the service of Nazi Germany. For example, in 1966, J. Armstrong used the Congress of the American Historical Association to portray the ounists as "friends of the Jews". Politicized bourgeois historiography is trying to pass over the fact that intestine anti-Semitism was one of the major principles that gave birth to the OUN, its official programmes called for fighting the Jews to the extent of their wholesale extermination, and the events of the Second World War demonstrated how methodical the ounists were in carrying through their "anti-Jewish action" programmes.

The Zionists' interest in the anti-Soviet status of American "Ukrainian studies" has shown itself in the creation of

joint "scientific" bodies and in joint activities. One typical example is the proceedings of a "symposium" which heard anything but fine interpretations of the "relationship between the Ukrainians and the Jews in the past and at present" [49]. Even American Slavic research periodicals had to acknowledge the oft-repeated attempts at passing over the crimes committed by the self-styled "fighters for the Ukraine" on the grounds of anti-Semitism. One of the subjects in Western historiography, the *Slavic Review* wrote [50], is the history of "Ukrainian-Jewish relations" which it considers only outwardly, as if unaware that the real object of the "study" of Ukrainian-Jewish relations is to "historically justify" an imperialist-sponsored strategic anti-Communist alliance of all kinds of what they call "national" organizations.

A research study called "On Certain Evolution of Jewish-Russian and Ukrainian-Jewish Relations", prepared by the Munich-based Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R. and published in the *Sučasnist'* magazine in 1963, contained a wide range of "arguments" in favour of pro-Zionist trends in "Ukrainian studies". First, it noted, the Zionists are "integrally connected" with the "system of private property", which automatically makes them a "dependable base of support for capitalism." Second, they "have made their positions in bourgeois social sciences" perfectly clear: their works are produced "under direct instructions and with exclusive financial support from American federal, primarily military sources". It has been likewise approvingly noted that Zionists, employed as teachers at American universities and colleges, instigate hatred for the U.S.S.R. trying to whip it up to "something like pathological". It went on to mention what it described as an "insufficiently known fact" that "in the times of so-called McCarthyism", they were active in "debunking" dissidents in the U.S. "The best" voucher for Zionists could be their record during the Truman presidency and their "enthusiasm" for the policy of anti-Communism which official Washington had adopted. At the same time, it was noted that Zionists were involved in many of the Western media, being engaged, notably, in a "huge number of anti-Soviet programmes on American television." The "study" called for the above-mentioned facts to be taken into account in "Ukrainological blueprints".

There has been a substantially increased exchange of interpretations between Zionist Sovietologists and "Ukrainologists" since the '60s. For example, at a symposium sponsored by the Institute of East European Jewish Studies in

Brandais University, U.S.A., anti-Soviet interpretations by "Ukrainologists" on matters relating to language and cultural development in the U.S.S.R. were in tune with similar arguments presented by Zionists [51]. So it was not surprising that "Ukrainological" theories should have been given a Zionist publicity in the Western press.

The growing number of Sovietologists trained in the postwar period has served to swell the paid force engaged in "Ukrainian studies". A comparative analysis enables the conclusion that the major training ground for titled "Ukrainologists" is the U.S., where 78 doctoral dissertations, expressly dealing with the Ukraine, were written in the space of 30 years (1950-1980). Sixteen doctoral papers were presented in Canada during the same period. It has to be noted that 51 out of the 56 doctoral dissertations on the history of the Ukraine presented in the U.S. and Canada were American. All that goes to show that the U.S. has now become the focal point of present-day bourgeois historiography of the Ukraine. The change I have just noted indicates how much store is set by training professionals for that branch of ideological warfare which is feeding on the concepts and stereotypes of anti-Communism.

Although the U.S. has created a system to "study" the history of the Ukrainian Republic, an analysis of its programmes and courses shows that none of them offers a more or less integral picture of the Ukraine's past and present either in the sense of a consistent summary of events or in that of an investigation of the nodal points of social, political and economic development. Attention is focussed on individual subjects and topics which, in the opinion of the organizers of "Ukrainian studies", can be used for a confrontation with the world of Socialism. It is indicative that repeated appeals for, and announcements of the preparation of a systematic "Western" course of the history of the Ukraine have invariably burst like so many soap-bubbles. History, even in its traditional bourgeois interpretation, is of no interest to the modern-day bosses of Sovietology who need only treatises on isolated subjects and issues that would "pay" for political struggle. For example, in 1977, the American Association for the Study of the Nationalities of the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe provided 40,000 dollars for a "modern university handbook" on the history of the Ukraine to be written in English. However, that initiative, which seemed to have a solid financial backing, has come to nothing. That shows once again that the very reason why the history of the Ukraine has been brought into U.S. university

science at all is not to study it as such, but to serve for the prosecution of ideological warfare, with science as cover.

"Ukrainian studies" have been organized within the structure of official bourgeois science in some other capitalist countries, along with the U.S., in the postwar period. In Canada, the state of "Ukrainology" generally reflects the overall picture of that country's dependence on the U.S., notably, the trend for local universities to get "Americanized", which Canadian researchers have to acknowledge whenever they review the nation's system of higher education [52]. The "study" of the Ukraine has been included right from the start in Slavic research programmes organized in close contact with American programmes [53]. Extension of this work was subsequently predicated, in large measure, on subsidies from U.S. corporate interests. In the '50s, the Rockefeller Foundation was one of the first to award 180,000 dollars to the Universities of British Columbia and Toronto for "the development of Slavic studies" incorporating "Ukrainological" courses.

"Ukrainology" comes second, after "Russian research", in the overall Slavic research programmes in Canada. Most of the staff involved is employed at four universities, those of Alberta, Manitoba, Toronto and Calgary [54]. Many of them had been trained in American universities, and some have come to hold important positions in Canadian Sovietology.

There is a particular thing to note about "Ukrainian studies" in Canada. The nominal excuse for launching them is quite often said to be the government's policy of sitting on the fence in view of the unending exacerbation of national ethnic conflicts. The governing quarters cannot fail to take into account the fact that the Ukrainian Canadian ethnic community comes third in the overall ethnic minority contingent and the present descendants of former settlers from Galicia and other Western lands of the Ukraine still retain a rather stable interest in the history and culture of the land of their fathers and forefathers. That is to say that while the financing of University centres out of the national budgets is quite often claimed to be provided to meet the ethnic needs of the Canadian Ukrainian community, the content of the Ukrainian programmes instituted is largely determined by Americanized Sovietologists.

Canadian "Ukrainology" has been closely co-operating with the U.S. Right from the first post-war years. Since 1959, there has been a co-ordinated activity of the centres that employ the bulk of "experts on the Ukraine" [55]. In 1976, the University of Alberta founded an Institute of Ukrainian

Studies which has very much in common with the Harvard Center. It was formed of the courses which had been run there earlier on and came to be financed by the Alberta provincial government. The annual subsidy in the foundation year was 355,000 dollars [56]. The Institute's top priorities are to promote extended syllabi and post-graduate research "in Ukrainian-Canadian and Ukrainian studies", "to encourage" the publication of appropriate works and to serve as an inter-university co-operating centre. The advance plan noted that the Institute did not run any courses of lectures, nor awarded diplomas [57]. The very fact that the Institute's administration includes some individuals who have had their anti-Soviet training in the U.S., as I. Rudnytsky and G. Luckyj, leaves no room for doubt as to the general character of research it does.

The university of Concordia is one of the first higher schools to have had a "course of history" introduced on the Institute's initiative in 1978. As far as the policy of awarding dissertation fellowships is concerned, it is determined by the special interest in the activities of reactionary immigrant organizations. For instance, in 1979, the Institute undertook to finance the preparation of a research project on the "ideology and political programme of the OUN" which was undertaken outside Canada — at the University of Michigan [58].

Bourgeois scientific institutions of certain countries of Western Europe are in close contact with American-Canadian "Ukrainology." In West Germany, the "study of the Ukraine" has been revived on the basis of the Ostforschung, restored and widely developed after the war.

The Munich Institute of Eastern Europe, founded in 1952, was one of the first after the end of the war to include the Ukraine in its curricula. Their "study" there began under schemes which have been brought into reactionary German historiography since very old times in a bid to justify the "Eastern policy" of German militarism. One factor that contributed towards it was the appointment as the Institute's director of H. Koch, a leading "expert" on the "Ukrainian question" in Hitler's Reich, and the invitation of some other fascist "consultants".

A "Society for the Promotion of Ukrainian Science", financed by the Federal Ministry for the Affairs of the Expellees, the Bavarian Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance and the Bavarian State Chancellory, was instituted with the cooperation of West German revenge-seekers in Munich in 1964 to stimulate similar "research". The Munich "Centre

of Ukrainian Science", housing "private" research centres, was operating under the auspices of that society.

In the post-war period, some "Ukrainological" research has been done by various centres in Britain, with the University of London and its Institute of Historical Research in the lead [59]. In 1952-1957, the School of Slavic and East European Studies attended, notably, by army officers and diplomatic officials, had curriculum enlarged with the introduction of a "Ukrainian course" [60]. The London School of Political and Economic Sciences has become yet another place to train "Ukrainologists" for work at the anti-Communist centres in the U.S. and Canada [61].

One centre engaged in falsifying the position of the Church in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic — one of the trends of British "studies" — is the centre to study religion and Communism at Keston College, founded in 1970. In 1975, it received a special subsidy of 30,000 dollars from the Ford Foundation to produce a publication on the "Catholic Church in the Ukraine and Lithuania" [62]. The Centre is active in extreme rightist propaganda campaigns against the U.S.S.R.

In France, the study of the Ukraine is mostly concentrated at the University of Paris. Its school of modern Oriental languages has a Ukrainian Language Department. The curriculum comprises the history, geography and literature of the Ukraine, along with the language. The "Ukrainological" programme is provided within the framework of the Department of Central and Eastern Europe but there is none of it at the Department of the Languages of the U.S.S.R.[63] That is not a chance occurrence but a case of satisfaction given to the long-standing ambition of political adventurers, driven out by Ukrainian working people, to "study" whatever has anything to do with the Ukraine in isolation from the history and culture of the Russian and other peoples of the U.S.S.R.

The "Ukrainian" subject is represented at the Slavic Institute of the Sorbonne. It also employs advocates of chauvinistic concepts. For example, the Centre of Comparative Literature sponsored a symposium on Ivan Franko in 1978 with the participation of Munich Ostforschers. The papers that were delivered there falsified not only the creative work of that great Ukrainian writer, but, under the guise of a historical study, misinterpreted his public activity as shown by the report on the "evolution of Ivan Franko's social and political outlook," presenting that revolutionary writer as an opponent of the ideas of social progress [64]. The falsifiers that

arrived there for a conference on Lesya Ukrainka in April 1982, cynically asserted that her creative work had "inspired" what they attempted to present as Ukrainian separatism[65]. As a matter of fact they echoed the prescriptions of a fascist, D. Dontsov, which was an insult to the memory of that great internationalist. But while Dontsov, who found himself in Poland between the two world wars, tried to use the name of that authoress to cover up his eulogy of Hitler's Reich, the latter-day "experts", following in his footsteps, blasphemously tried to present Lesya Ukrainka's ideas as anticipating the militaristic theories of NATO ideologues.

It is quite natural that the writings of those who have been trying to inject versions based on chauvinistic reasoning into the French historiography of the U.S.S.R. are repugnant, indeed. One case in point is the publications, based on very dubious sources, by H. Carrère d'Encausse who appears to see anything she turns to as evidence of "friction" and "clash" of interests between the Russians and the Ukrainians and other Soviet peoples.

In considering the system of the study of the Ukraine within the framework of bourgeois academic science, one should note that not all of its lines of research on the subject have been brought into existence by anti-Communist trends. There are some monographs and articles even in bourgeois publications in the West that do not share a biassed approach to Ukrainian history. Methodologically, they are written from positions of objectivism, but in terms of applied historical research, these exponents of bourgeois science are seen to strive for a sober and independent examination of the true picture of social-political and economic processes, without succumbing to the extraneous interference of Sovietology. In their writings, they furnish an abundance of material relating to the Ukraine, borrowed from public records and other foreign sources, including Soviet public record offices, and contain a good amount of interesting information, observations, assessments and findings about various periods of Ukrainian history.

The standard of such studies compares favourably with the writings of those authors whose scientific thinking is handicapped by slanted preconceptions. There is one more thing one must not overlook: the writings of those who do not want their research effort to be tied to a hostile attitude to the Soviet Union incur the displeasure of licensed Sovietologists who attempt either to pass over the works of those "dissenters" or react with "warning" criticism against them.

4. "FREE SCIENCE IN DIASPORA": FACT AND FICTION

One point to note about the "study of the Ukraine" is that, along with university centres, it is conducted by organizations operating behind the signboard of "free science in Diaspora". Certain elements in the West call them "private" and "independent" institutions of people of Ukrainian extraction. Members of these organizations are ostentatiously referred to as "Ukrainian scholars" and their writings as "Ukrainian" in Sovietological periodicals and at conferences, adding the adjective "free". This is no longer an ethnic characterization which could be justified in view of the existence of compact groups of people of Ukrainian origin within the ethnic communities of a number of countries. In this case, ethnicity is played up as a political challenge to Soviet science in the Ukrainian Republic and, in the long run, to Socialism as a social system.

Therefore, to find out what „free Ukrainian science" really is in the West becomes a point of principle.

Naturally, it is impossible to appreciate this relationship without analyzing the activities of the organizations concerned. Among those in prominence is the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S. (UAAS). It has its origin closely connected with the operations of the American occupation authorities in West Germany which sanctioned the granting of subsidies to former officials of Hitler's institutions and the press. It had 18,000 marks awarded to it in 1948 alone through the Joint Ukrainian-American Relief Committee established by the U.S. authorities.

The structure of the UAAS, which had its headquarters at Augsburg at first, was geared to the employment of social sciences for anti-Soviet purpose. Quite a few "reports" were delivered and quite a few "papers" published within the first five years of its existence. However, nearly all of them were nothing but updated publications financed earlier on by Nazi services and the West Ukrainian bourgeoisie.

A new centre of the "Academy" sprang up in the U.S. following the start of a full-scale movement of "displaced persons" across the Atlantic at the turn of the '50s. It was also organized under the plans of imperialist secret services. To give it any status whatsoever, it had a statute hastily approved for it in 1950 as that of an American institution with powers to operate throughout the nation. However, the legal procedure was undertaken, in fact just to disguise the role of that ostensibly independent organization that was

intended as an adjunct of the Russian Institute at Columbia University. The Institute's director, Philip Mosely, became its first patron and, as a member of the UAAS, was personally in charge of its activities [66].

In the opening stages, specialists from the Russian Institute viewed the new organization as a source of "primary" material about the Ukraine. At a time when the system of Sovietological centres in the U.S. was still in the making, the concepts of American Sovietologists were largely based on the "knowledge" of fugitive Ostforschers. They kept the records of immigrant organizations operating in DP camps and printed matter produced on the territory of what was then the American occupation zone of Germany. In that period, UAAS members were enrolled at American universities and colleges concerned with Sovietology. More and more often the works produced as "Ukrainian studies" and paid for at Harvard and other universities saw the light of day under the UAAS signboard as "independent Ukrainian" reports.

It was the same American patrons that got down to distributing such "scientific" publications. Here is a fact worthy of note: in 1959 the American Committee for Liberation bought up full printings of books under the UAAS trademark for its own library (it had 32 subsidiaries in Western Europe to offer its "services" to immigrants). The Committee chairman, H. Sargeant, in a special statement stressed the necessity of using these publications "in the struggle against Communism". At the same time, that is in the '50s, those pseudoscientists of the "Academy" organized the dispatch of their publications and "information material" to The Voice of America, Radio Liberty and similar institutions for radio propaganda against the Ukrainian Republic.

The language barrier, which at first divided the majority of the "Orientalists" transported from Europe, did not allow them to get directly involved in "research" at university level. However, the chiefs of Sovietology found a way out. The English-language *Annals* were launched in 1951 with the initial investment of 5,000 dollars provided by the Ford Foundation. Such donations have since become a standing practice. In 1955, the UAAS and SSS, as New York papers reported, received 30,000 dollars apiece, to finance their editions. In 1956, the Foundation provided a further 12,500 dollars for publications on "East European topics". *The Annals* began to reprint writings by ideologues of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism of the '20s and '30s. That was the starting point in a systematic drive to bring long since scientifically

disproved concepts of the history of the Ukraine into American historiography. Although *The Annals* were considered to be a UAAS publication, the magazine was virtually operating as the mouthpiece of Sovietological centres of the U.S., Canada and some other countries, whose representatives formed part of its editorial board and contributed their reflexions to it at regular intervals.

One typical outgrowth of the Cold War was an organization which arrogated to itself the name of the T. G. Shevchenko Scientific Society which existed in Lvov at one time and was incorporated in the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in 1940. American secret services busy ferreting out "experts on Soviet affairs" in the camps of West Germany, found that kind of mystification acceptable for collecting "specialists" in ideological subversion. Even foreign bourgeois sources pointed out that the SSS emerged as a conglomeration of "displaced persons" (among whom there were quite a few fascist henchmen whose cases still appear in the U.S. judiciary and immigration agencies) for adapting them to a "new life" [67]. The SSS ringleaders are more specific in describing their objectives. One document, *Basic Principles of Co-operation*, approved in New York in December 1969, proclaimed a commitment to the policy of anti-Communism to be an indispensable condition for membership of that "society" and made it a duty of its members to conduct ideological attacks against the U.S.S.R. within the framework of academic science. The "papers" produced by members of the society, regardless of the particular period they dealt with, contained views in keeping with the claims of the most vicious policy-makers. For example, the founder of the SSS branch in the U.S., N. Chubaty offered his own writings denying the common origin of the Russian, Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples as... "evidence of degradation of the Soviet Union" [68].

The SSS top crust considers it to be its overriding objective to serve the interests of imperialist ringleaders by means of pushing controversial interpretations of the history of the Ukraine into Western social science. It was noted in the "Society's" Munich publication as early as 1948 that "science" which it represented "must operate in the Anglo-Saxon world". In plain terms, that meant its members had to participate in current anti-Communist campaigns. Merely three months after the proclamation of the "Truman Doctrine" there was a rally of SSS members in Munich on the subject of producing an *Encyclopaedia of Ukrainology*. Having received subsidies from the East European Fund, Inc.,

they started preparing that edition in a hurry, using materials which had been compiled on instructions from the military intelligence service of the Third Reich. Without waiting for the work on the *"Encyclopaedia"* to be completed, SSS members hastily put out a handbook *Ukraine and Its People* in 1949. It was a "modernized" English version of what had earlier been produced by the Berlin-based Ukrainian Scientific Institute to meet the needs of the Nazi aggressors. The Americans allocated 8,300 marks for that edition.

The first volume of an *Encyclopaedia of Ukrainology* appeared in the same year. The "reference" articles for it had been provided by former Nazi henchmen. For example, the section on *The Military Potential of the Ukraine* had been written by P. Shandruk and O. Horbač who had served with the Halychina SS Division. They advertised the "possibilities of intervention from the Black Sea" and the bombing raids on Ukrainian cities by the "Strategic Air Force", and offered their hints for "blocking" railways and other communications of the Republic.

The SSS "research" findings have been disseminated, first and foremost, as anti-Soviet treatises published with financial support from American corporate interests. The main financial donor of the SSS was the East European Find expressly created for stimulating anti-Communist interpretations in historiography and other disciplines. The Fund provided its money for the establishment of a Ukrainian Book Publishing House which was reported by the American press to have received 35,000 dollars as early as 1955.

The "Society's" ringleaders have been going out of their way to make their treatises available to a large readership, preparing English-language publications to that end. It is indicative that such products have been principally supplied by university Sovietologists of the U.S., Canada, and some countries of Western Europe. These publications, ostensibly produced by a "private" organization, have been used to give currency to the most controversial and preposterous judgements and gross fabrications very much along the lines of the stereotypes of the propaganda of the "yellow press" and subversive radio voices.

The tactics the "Society" has been using in preparing its "writings" betray its function — that of promoting pro-militarist trends in Sovietology: SSS members have been "specializing" in gathering primary material, all kinds of far-fetched ideas and false interpretations for handing them over to the individuals on whom their existence depends.

That came to light right after the end of the Second World War, when the SSS rallied former Nazi henchmen on the run. They put together the text of a book *Ukraine Under the Soviets* by Associated Professor C. Manning of Columbia University, a piece of rabid anti-Communism. The preface mentioned the names of 14 SSS members who had collaborated in producing that publication [69].

The SSS has been expanding the output of English-language publications for American and other "experts" on the Soviet Union. Their major concern, prompted by extreme reactionary elements, has been to slander the revolutionary struggle of the Ukrainian working people and whitewash in every possible way the bourgeois parties and "governments" with imperialist invaders behind them during the Civil War. The principal contributors are the individuals engaged in "Ukrainian studies" at university centres. The same trend has made itself evident in co-operation with the American Association for the Study of Nationalities of the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe: "The Society" has been invited to act as a co-publisher of its magazine in conjunction with the Department of History at East Illinois University.

The Ukrainian Free University (UFU), which has been brought into existence as part of the activities in Vienna of some remnants of the defeated Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries who dreamed of coming back to the Ukraine and restoring their dictatorship there, has also been classed as an organization of "ethnic science" in the West. Later on, the UFU was moved to Prague which was a rallying point of "the spiritual elite" of counter-revolution which was giving full-scale support to Hitler's designs. Shortly before Nazi Germany's perfidious attack on the U.S.S.R., one of the then UFU professors, J. Rudnyckyj, who found refuge in Canada after the war, appealed in the *Krakiv'ski Visti* on May 4, 1941, to his colleagues to align themselves with such centres of "science" as the fascist institutes of "clan and race research" in Berlin and the "study of Jewry" in Frankfurt am Main which were devising and publishing as "research studies" the "arguments" in favour of a policy of "extermination of inferior peoples" such as Slavs and Jews. The "Free University" man unequivocally put phis question: "Don't we need at least one specialist in this field?" And that was more than mere rhetoric. As a member of the fascist repressive staff in Galicia, a partisan of Nazi geopolitics, V. Kubijovič, testified in 1948, the UFU, which the bonzes of the Reich found to be of interest to them, "operated all the time" while the war was going on.

In 1946, the UFU resumed its operations in Munich under the patronage of the American occupation authorities, and was subsequently handed over to those of Bavaria, which have since been responsible for subsidizing the UFU. In 1974, it got a subsidy of 450,000 marks from the Bavarian authorities to acquire a "Science Centre" [70].

The Bavarian UFU has developed into a nursery of falsehoods regarding history, philosophy and psychology. In its opening years, its operations consisted mostly in the issue of diplomas of higher education to former Nazi henchmen. At present, thought it still receives subsidies from West German and American money-bags and so can employ lecturers, it has no students at either of its two departments. In search of them, their "rector" is touring Western countries all the time and no end of letter-invitations are being sent in all possible directions. It is for a handful of students thus brainwashed that they give "class-room" instruction and a truncated "summer course" going on for three weeks a year. Since a real student has become a scarce acquisition for the "free university", its superiors do not disdain schoolchildren. One of the practical objectives of the "summer courses" is to initiate their students into the "values of the Western world" for which purpose they organize visits to the Munich headquarters of the subversion radio stations, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. The design is not particularly sophisticated: to tempt some of them into taking up the job of slanderer.

It is not surprising that many young people, while really craving for higher education, shun the Munich "Science Centre", although it advertizes itself as a "free" one. The reason is only that the UFU does not provide, nor can it provide any substantive knowledge essential for professional employment because the tune in it is called by individuals engaged in psychological warfare. It is indicative that there have been quite a few scandals in the West, when UFU graduates tried to get an appointment at American universities.

If you look through "monographs" and "handbooks" prepared by its staffers, you will find it rather difficult to distinguish between the rehashes of writings by Nazi masterminds and the crazy ideas of chauvinism. The pseudo-professors retell in every way they can the "proof" of the "superiority" of some peoples over others and the geopolitical theory of "living space" and "cultural frontiers" — everything that the Third Reich clique used as the starting

point in launching its aggressive policies against the neighbouring countries.

There are "summer terms" at UFU designed to attract individuals keen on scientific degrees. The graduates may just as well get a doctorate there. This opportunity to take a doctor's degree without too much effort attracts career politicians from the U.S., Canada and some other Western countries. These doctorships are just like a conveyor-belt production. Eighty-eight doctoral diplomas were issued there in the space of eight years, from 1968 to 1976 [71].

Among those who have taken their "scientific degrees" in Munich are some that have been turned out of colleges and universities of the U.S., Canada and some other countries, officers of the aggressive NATO bloc, as well as those who keep "free university" in existence — ultra-right politicians connected with monopoly interests. Among those who were the first to be "awarded" their "doctorates" are a former Congressman Charles Cursten, the organizer of anti-Communist hysteria in the U.S. and James Burnham, a propagandist of the conversion of the Cold War into a hot war. Among the honorary doctors you will find some Third Reich loyalists, such as D. Doroshenko, a twister of history who sought to "prove", on an assignment from the Nazis, Germany's right to the annexation of Ukrainian lands and Paul Rohrbach, a theorist of geopolitics and propagandist of the Drang Nach Osten slogan.

Even the American signboard "The Ukrainian Historical Association, Inc." serves to indicate that the ethnically-based "science" centres are integral to bourgeois social sciences. Among its members there are some teachers and librarians of universities and colleges as well as "enthusiasts of history." In 1975, the American Historical Association officially recognized this society as its subsidiary [72]. That meant formalizing the earlier practice of the participation of the members of that society in the proceedings of the association while "Ukrainian science in exile" has been recognized as part of American bourgeois historiography.

The society has been advertizing itself in front of specialist historians as a vehicle of "free historical science". The publications you can find in the "Society's" journal provide a clear idea of what it is like. Their key note is the propaganda of their interpretations of history based on politicized schemes of D. Doroshenko and others like him. Articles in this sense are contributed by teachers of Harvard, Denver and some other universities of the United States.

The products put on sale as "Ukrainian science abroad"

are, on close examination, the derivatives of the operations of the Sovietological centres of the U.S., Canada, West Germany and some other Western countries. Let me note in this context that at a "Congress of Free Ukrainians" in 1967 — a rally that was claimed to represent Ukrainian ethnic groups in capitalist countries, a report on "the objectives of Ukrainian science in the free world" for the benefit of the members of the SSS and other similar centres, was made by none other than C. Manning, one of the chiefs of anti-Soviet "Ukrainology" in the United States.

Although a fresh force of university-trained "Ukrainologists" has been swelling the contingent of Sovietologists from the early 1960s onward while the role of ethnically based "scientific" organizations has declined, the latter are still an essential component of the system in operation to twist history, which is due to a number of factors. First, as "private" organizations, they are considered in Sovietology as an additional channel for the propagation of the most vicious falsifications prepared under plans and on orders of secret services. Second, SSS-type organizations are seen as lieutenant organizations providing Sovietology with interpretations borrowed from the records of old bourgeois historiography. Third, being as they are a rallying point of politicians, defectors, and retired Slavists, they are maintained with a view to "justifying" the false claim about the existence in the West of "free Ukrainian science" whose "works" Sovietologists seek to qualify as an "antidote" to... science in the Soviet Ukraine [73].

Accordingly, this trickery is used to cover up the foulest tactics to discredit Ukrainian Soviet science and, above all, its historiography. One is to pass over a vast majority of works created by historians and other specialists in the Ukrainian Republic, so as to support the stories about "science in Diaspora". Historiographic surveys produced by Sovietologists are usually limited to publications of "ethnic" editions in the West and sometimes contain no information at all about any research done in the Ukrainian Republic. One specimen that is noteworthy in this context is the survey of publications on the "history of Russia and Eastern Europe" in the journal of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, which has some references to Ukrainian problems [74].

Reviews of current literature about the Ukraine in professional bourgeois periodicals are no less biassed. While considering practically all foreign publications about the Ukraine, including those of "private societies", the reviewers

leave out the works by Soviet scholars, trying to conceal the actual scale of historical research in the Ukrainian Republic[75]. Their major preoccupation is to dismiss the findings of this research and denigrate the scientific methods it is using. There has been a particularly virulent succession of attacks by "independent science" on Soviet publications exposing the scheming of anti-Communist centres.

So the allegations about the existence of a "free science in Diaspora" are disproved by the very performance of its centres. Attempts at passing them off for some Ukrainian institutions are designed to divert attention from the actual masterminds and organizers of Western falsifications of the historical development of the Ukrainian Republic.

5. JUGGLING WITH DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

It is a matter of common knowledge that reference to primary sources is an important condition of any historical investigation. However, the presence of references in the back matter of a research paper, an indication of sources, quotations from them or their re-telling are not by themselves enough to evaluate their scientific level. Primary sources are basic to interpretations, evaluations, and generalizations are, therefore, matters of particular significance in foreign Sovietological "writings", all the more so since the great majority of all documents on the history of the Ukraine is to be found in the public record offices of the Ukraine, not in Western countries that play host to "Ukrainological" centres. This accounts for quite an effect being made there to gather special document collections in public libraries and record offices, discover unpublished things, etc.

Western social science has been increasingly using the term "Ukrainica" to denote the major background source of "Ukrainian studies." There has even been an attempt at Harvard University in recent years to work out "criteria" by which to identify a source as "Ukrainica." These are a) material in the Ukrainian language; b) material considered to have originated in Ukrainian ethnic territory; c) any material concerning the Ukraine; d) writings on whatever subject by persons of Ukrainian origin[76].

Nevertheless, for all the efforts made, there is a "shortage" of "requisite archivalia", as the chroniclers of "Ukrainology" have themselves admitted. Quite often one may come across treatises compiled with few references to primary sources or none at all, that is, neglecting even the nominal requirements of science. For instance, the *Ukrainsky Istoryk*

of the American Ukrainian Historical Society, in a 1967 review of N. Chirovsky's *Introduction to Russian History,* extensively quoting judgements about the past history of the Ukraine, stated that the author "is almost not using any prime sources at all", "quite often" replacing them with references to his own previous publications which are "manifestly compilatory work". "On the whole", the magazine said, "this work looks like a piece of political journalism rather than a historical investigation".

The scarcity of documentary evidence behind Sovietological publications, which some authors complain about, is equally true of the sources that are available in the U.S.S.R. and beyond its confines. For instance, a librarian of the Harvard Ukrainian Scientific Institute E. Kosinec has pointed out that "collections in the Soviet Ukraine, with only some exceptions, still remain little used by North American researchers, while the same collections in our country are virtually inaccessible" [77].

The inadequate use of documents has been due, however, not so much to their actual accessibility, as to the biassed characher of ideas and schemes. For that reason, a great number of primary sources contradicting the prescribed scheme is not mentioned or is ignored altogether. Such an attitude has become an unwritten law for many "studies" of the Ukraine. One typical case in point is the doctoral dissertation by G. Kulchycky "The Ukrainian Insurgent Movement 1919 to 1926" which was accepted by the "Russian Area Research" Department at Georgetown University. Its source material has been divided into three parts: "documents," "memoirs," and "books," although the text is essentially built on "recollections" by counter-revolutionaries who fled abroad. Such a choice of "sources" was designed to whitewash the kulak banditry.

There are some publications in the West, on the other hand, which have a rather large stock of historical records selected with a lot of bias. For instance, publications devoted to the history of the Ukraine since the October Revolution are based on material gathered by intelligence and propaganda services, including those borrowed from public record offices and presenting some polls of "displaced persons", hand-written "eye-witness accounts" of defectors, pronouncements of fascist collaborationists taken down in shorthand during anti-Communist "hearings" of all kinds, etc. The overwhelming majority of this material has been fabricated with special subsidies from imperialist Powers to incite hostility for the Soviet Union. To this end there have

been poll of "displaced persons", known as the "Harvard project", and a "Research Program on the U.S.S.R." by the East European Fund. Such "projects" have been used in postwar American Sovietology to resolve one of the "major problems" — that of creating "sources" about the U.S.S.R., as Slavic research experts of Indiana University have found [78].

The gathering of "sources" that has nothing to do with a scientific approach and the involvement of organizations and individuals hostile to the Soviet Union in this job have made such archival reviews no more than accumulators of slander and fact-twisting. Yet it is these "primary sources" that are unquestioningly used in "Ukrainian studies" as "historical" arguments. One typical case in point in this sense has been a monograph by Y. Bilinsky, based on "documents" from anti-Soviet centres like the Munich-based Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R., SSS, UAAS, UFU, Prologue, UCCA (Ukrainian Congressional Committee of America) and so on, as well as on the material procured through the "polls" of "displaced persons" [79]. The same has been the background to the monographs by J. Armstrong, B. Dmytryshyn, A. Dallin, to mention just a few.

In an effort to review still earlier periods of Soviet history with that kind of "documentary evidence", some authors have been turning to the archives of the U.S., Austria, West Germany, and some other capitalist countries, keeping material on the particular aspects of the events in the Ukraine. These are the records of diplomatic, military and some other organizations which quite often represent the view of the ruling establishment of those countries. The material supplied by counter-revolutionary organizations is also used most extensively. As far as the sources of Soviet origin are concerned, they are mentioned only in connection with some particular issues. This kind of background selection produces writings that twist history beyond recognition. For example, a monograph on the history of relations between the Ukraine and Russia in 1917-1918 has as few as 35 Soviet sources mentioned in the total back matter of 238, the rest being Western publications mostly by members of bankrupt parties and organizations [80].

It should be noted that some Western historians have developed a special kind of attitude to sources coming from counter-revolutionary organizations. Certain researchers, dealing with Ukrainian subjects, consider it impossible to use the above-mentioned materials without any reservation. For instance, in a review of I. Kamenetsky's "Hitler's Occu-

pation of the Ukraine", J. Armstrong pointed out that the author distrusted "emigre accounts" which "tend to overemphasize the role" of OUN-type organizations [81].

Since the sources of counter-revolutionary origin look suspicious to the scientific community as outspokenly biassed, pseudoukrainologists have been resorting to all kinds of trickery. A review of the book *Western Ukraine and the Turning Point of Europe's History*, published in the *American Historical Review*, pointed out that the authors "do not give the source of the information or where the source can be found" [82]. They doctor even official documents. For instance, in the above-mentioned book I. Kamenetsky presented the operations of Soviet partisans in the Ukraine, described in secret Nazi materials, as evidence of the activity of OUN groups.

Besides, there have been books using Soviet sources — collections of documents and material from the press. However, while creating a semblance of objectivity by referring to these documents, Sovietologists apply tactics of no benefit to science. They play up negative things without saying that these things have been properly assessed from positions of principle in the documents of the CPSU and the Soviet State, detach certain quotations from their context, pick isolated facts to bear out the conclusions on matters one can credibly judge only by having studied historical facts in their totality. By using Soviet sources in such a way, they offer their "own" interpretation of the well-known facts which is a far cry from a real impartial description of actual reality. As a case in point, one may refer to the monograph *Soviet Politics and the Ukraine*, by R. Sullivant who tried, by expressly misinterpreting Soviet documents and materials from the press, to sell the idea about a "struggle" between the "Centre" and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in the '20s and '30s. He has the same kind of slanted approach to research papers by Soviet authors. It does show that the line pursued by "Ukrainology" is at variance with the elementary methods of scientific investigation.

As far as the problems of the Ukraine's pre-Revolution history are concerned, these are treated by drawing upon, wholly and entirely, the publications of Czarist Russia and archival material from Austria, France, West Germany, Britain, the Vatican, and some other States. It is clearly impossible to produce an impartial historical review by relying on these sources only, without taking into account anything one can get in Soviet archival depositories which contain major documents on all the problems in question and by ignoring

the work of Soviet researchers. All that compels bourgeois writers to twist and turn. A historian of University of California C. O'Brien, setting out to describe the relationship between the Russian State and the Ukraine in the 17th century, mentioned French and Austrian archives as well as certain publications of historical documents in the U.S.S.R. and monographs by Soviet authors. However, none of the 250 references in the text itself quote any documents from Soviet historical records although we have them published in plenty. Instead, they quote indirect sources, like extracts from the correspondence of foreign ambassadors and from some pre-Revolution Russian documentary publications. The book has ten references to works by Soviet researchers, but all on minor details. Instead, O'Brien turns scores of times to writings by separatists for "arguments". Naturally, such selection of material on this problem condemns a large number of inferences in that monograph to inconsistency. As he felt he was in a vulnerable position, the author found himself compelled to state in his introductory note that he did not pretend to give an "arresting new interpretation of the Ukrainian issue" [83]. Indeed, what he actually did was largely to repeat the interpretations of the history of the Ukrainian people by reactionary emigres.

One should note that "memoirs" figure prominently among the sources used most. One can hardly find a publication, particularly on the recent history of the Ukraine, without uncritical references to "reminiscences" of bankrupt personalities, organizers and activists of OUN banditry and other enemies of the Ukrainian people as well as Whiteguards and anti-Soviet-minded politicians in capitalist countries. Publishers and periodicals of "ethnic" organizations, which regularly bring our "reminiscences" by the man of ataman Petlyura, and functionaries of the Nazi occupation authorities, etc., are at pains to enlarge this base of source material. A large number of such "memoirs", used in the "studies," are still in manuscript form and concentrated in the "collections" of university Sovietological centres and private archives.

Public record documents and other materials kept in various countries began to be brought into the open and registered as university "Ukrainian scientific institutes" emerged in America in the '70s. There have been articles describing archival depositories and collections of printed matter on Ukrainica. That is how reviews of material from the Public Record Office of the British Foreign Office and those of the Bundesarchiv in Bonn have appeared [84]. This kind of source-

seeking is of no value, however, for the simple reason that it has been undertaken to serve individuals that operate under programmes which rule out the very possibility of impartial coverage of the Ukraine's historical record. No "enlargement" of primary sources in centres committed to falsification can even change anything about their quite definitely biassed approach to quoting documents.

As one can see from an examination of bibliographical publications, descriptions of the funds of "collections" and an analysis of the use of sources in monographs and articles, the bulk of material to be found in bourgeois Ukrainica generally reflects the standpoint of exploiter classes. These sources are, as a rule, treated apologetically. This line is exacerbated by other inexcusable tactics of interpretation of documents, by passing them over or treating them lop-sidedly. Such source material cannot, naturally, by itself ensure the objective portrayal of social-political or any other developments of the past and the present.

6. WEDDED TO PROPAGANDA

Although the products of "Ukrainological" centres feature at conferences and in professional periodicals i. e., in the realm of Western social science, it would be wrong to think that their activities are confined to that. This is a point of principle because the major foreign centres engaged in the "study" of the history of the Ukraine are concentrated within the system of bourgeois academic science which denies its connection with political propaganda.

One can find the clue to this question in the assessments by the founders of true social science. Marx, Engels and Lenin provided conclusive arguments to show that bourgeois science involved in the ideological battle of classes inevitably makes common cause with reactionary political journalism and propaganda. For instance, Lenin, ripping the mask off the proponents of chauvinism, wrote: "This dirty and despicable work is undertaken, not only by the scum of the Black Hundreds, but also by reactionary professors, scholars, journalists and members of the Duma" [85].

The "Big press" is still well to the fore in the massive propaganda system of imperialism. Publications of *The New York Times*, a mouthpiece of the U.S. power elite, provide typical "coverage" of the present and the past history of the Ukrainian Republic. They ignore, as a rule, the constructive labour effort of the people of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in the economic and cultural fields.

In its coverage of current events, it is quite often using the assessments borrowed from Western "Ukrainological" historiography. As early as 1946, presenting a false picture of life in the Ukraine in the early post-war months, the paper tried to give a "historical" explanation of its special interest in stoking up ethnic friction by alleging that the Ukraine had been a hotbed of "turmoil and separatism in Russia" at all times [86]. The reason why *The New York Times* editors needed to make that blasphemous appeal to history was in order to present the operations of the surviving Nazi-made bands, staging acts of terrorism in West Ukrainian lands at the time, in a light that was to benefit the then policy of U.S. imperialism. It was that kind of "knowledge" of Ukrainian history that was offered as one of the arguments for moulding an anti-Soviet policy course in the U. S. One indication of the support the paper gave to that banditry was a letter it published right after the above-mentioned article by one of the former fascist agents who extolled a "merciless struggle" against popular government in the Ukraine [87].

Such an approach came to dominate the paper's interpretations in the subsequent years. Most of its items about the Ukraine were allegations of "disturbances" and "rebellions" etc. Although at a later stage, *The New York Times* had to drop that wishful thinking, its references to the Ukraine in the '60s still played into the hands of those who wanted the Cold War to continue. Its comments on the international celebrations in Kiev of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Taras Shevchenko were a typical case in point. The commentator gave ambiguous assessments of that great Ukrainian poet and public figure who glorified the love for freedom and the struggle of oppressed peoples. The paper referred to the "nationalist values" of Shevchenko's works as something that went without saying, yet never stated in black and white what it actually meant by that phrase. At the same time, it was manifestly sceptical of his definition as "revolutionary and democrat", which has been given by great writers of various nationalities. *The New York Times* chose to call him "Ukrainian nationalist" in its headline [88]. Whether the editors wanted to do so or not, the profile they offered to their readers was that of a poet in the image and likeness of those who, while claiming to be "Ukrainian nationalists", had actually disgraced themselves by hostile scheming against their native land and people who had freed themselves from social and ethnic oppression in the course of the victorious Socialist Revolution of 1917. Then,

entrenched on the other side of the Atlantic, they called or the governments of the United States and other Western Powers to impose military, political and other "drastic sanctions" against the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the USSR in general.

With an eye on Washington's official doctrine of "bridge-building", the paper followed the "experts" from Sovietological centres in more and more often speculating on the "Ukrainian national problem" considered as basic to the "propaganda war" of the West [89]. It also used false Sovietological interpretations of the "national problem." While referring to the events of the Second World War, the paper spoke not so much of the struggle of the Ukrainian people together with the peoples of the sister republics against Hitler's aggression, as about "Ukrainian nationalism," notably, about the bands that were coming in the wake of the fascist German army. It lamented the failure of the Third Reich "to do anything" to use the "separatist possibilities" of its hirelings. Political speculation in the shape of "preoccupation" over the future of the Ukraine's national heritage has become the paper's fixed idea. It has been interpreting even the contingencies nobody is safe from as encroachments on ethnic rights. Once a fire broke out in St. George's Church in Kiev, which was incidentally quick put out and damaged part of the building quickly repaired, with the money donated by the State, *The New York Times* lost no time in suggesting that there were "political" reasons behind that accident, connected with the "problems of ethnic minorities" in the Soviet Union [90]. Three days later, still insisting on that piece of lie about the life of the Ukrainian people, the paper unequivocally quoted the source of its speculation: Zbigniew Brzezinski. It played up his assertion that the national relations issue would be one of greater magnitude in the U.S.S.R. in the coming decade than the racial problem ever was in the U.S.[91] In that way, the mouthpiece of U.S. corporate interests showed that its invectives regarding the past and the present of the Ukrainian Republic had been prompted by its intention to distract public attention from the actual racial and ethnic conflicts rocking the citadel of modern capitalism.

Whatever the Sovietologists pass off for their scientific conclusions about the Ukrainian Republic migrates into the columns of the corporate press without any particular modification. It is noteworthy that the Ukrainian theme is systematically played up even in the press of conservative and ultra-rightist groups. References to the Ukraine come toge-

ther with shopworn stereotypes tailored to suit neo-McCarthyist slogans designed to sow the seeds of hatred for progressive movements and organizations in capitalist countries, above all for the Communist Party, U.S.A. The periodicals by right-wing and ultra-rightist organizations, like *Freedom's Facts*, the *Human Events*, the *National Review*, as well as the "commercial" gutter press toe the same line.

Similar interpretations are circulated by bourgeois newspapers and magazines of Canada, Britain, West Germany, and some other countries. One point that is worthy of particular note is that they bring out their articles about the Ukraine not all alone, but in unison with the propaganda mouthpieces of the U.S It has become a standing rule for the stream of "information" on "Ukrainian" topics to swell at a time of imperialist campaigns against any particular Socialist country. The point is that the strategists of anti-Communism see the "Ukrainian" slander stories as a means of whipping up the propaganda of hostility towards the U.S.S.R. and Socialism in general. It is not surprising that such tactics should have been used just before and in the course of the counter-revolutionary revolt in Hungary in 1956, the escalation of the American aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (the 1960s) and attempts at staging a "quiet counter-revolution" in Czechoslovakia (1968-1969). It was also employed in the frenzied "psychological battle" of imperialism against the Polish people in the early '80s.

Whatever the corporate press of various shades and hues has to say about the Ukrainian Republic is direct evidence of the mendacity and hypocrisy of all protestations about its "freedom" and "independence" and a confirmation of the fundamental Leninist conclusion about the monopoly press as an instrument for "duping and cheating the mass of working people" [92]. The "commentaries" of that press on "reports" about the Ukraine are products of invalid interpretations of the Ukrainian history "worked out" in the centres of Sovietology.

The rightist ethnic press is one contingent of imperialist propaganda that should deserve a special mention. It carries biassed material about our country day in, day out, having chosen people of Ukrainian origin in capitalist countries as the main target of their propaganda effort.

It should be noted that far from all of this registered printed matter abroad can be classed as the "press". Many of these publications appear only occasionally and are intended for "home consumption" by members of this or that organi-

zation. Their average circulation is just a thousand or two. There are publications which appear only in a few hundred or even a few score of copies. Nevertheless, the reactionary elements of the U.S. and some other countries do not disdain that kind of pseudopress either in spreading their insinuations against the U.S.S.R.

Just as in the Sovietological system, the major source of financing, quite often unannounced, is through subsidies which come in various ways. These may be the paid ads by capitalist firms and bourgeois parties, secret handouts from imperialist secret services, and money coming from Church and religious centres with extremists at their head. At the same time, there are official government subsidies disguised as "encouragement of the cultural activity of ethnic groups." Most of them are used for propaganda, including support of the press. For instance, in 1973-1974, the Government of Canada assigned over 450,000 dollars for "Ukrainian" organizations. The greater part of that money was transmitted to centres wedded to rabid anti-Communism. In the U.S., official subsidies for the "development of culture" by ethnic groups get into the hands of anti-Soviet groups only.

In its commentaries on the Ukraine, this press is using the same sources as do the centres of "Ukrainian studies." There are "memoirs" by members of counter-revolutionary organizations, items fabricated by secret services, articles borrowed from the corporate "Big Press", etc. There is a particularly extensive effort to advertize the products of "Ukrainology" through treatises, collections, abstract, and individual articles which have appeared in the university and other publishing houses. In this way, the reactionary ethnic press is operating as a kind of accumulator of distorted and thought-up "facts" about the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

While playing its role as a specialist sector of imperialist propaganda, it is pursuing the objective that is common to all bourgeois press and periodicals — slurring over racial conflicts in capitalist societies and covering up their class roots. The "Ukrainological" periodicals appearing in the U.S. have practically no room left for information and commentaries on discrimination against the Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Indians and other coloured people. Moreover, the mouthpieces which call themselves "ethnic" stubbornly refuse to take up fundamental social and communal problems which worry the ethnic Ukrainian communities across the Atlantic. All that is nothing short of a conspiracy of silence to further the domination by monopoly capital.

Being as it is an instrument of ideological and psychological brainwashing of foreign-based Ukrainians, this press is not a closed system either. It is preparing publications "on Ukrainian issues" on orders from political and other circles of capitalist countries. The ruling groups support them as a vehicle which, taking "examples" from the life of the Soviet Ukraine, is designed to discredit the theory and the actual experience of Socialism, the ideas of co-operation between nations and the policy of international detente.

In spreading biassed versions about Socialism, the press of the capitalist countries acts in conjunction with broadcasting services that discharge functions very much like those of the "yellow press". These programmes consist of "news" from the Ukraine and "talks" about the history of the Ukrainian people. These items are, as a rule, made anti-Soviet by including pronouncements by Sovietologists, retelling Western publications tailored to the patterns of black propaganda. Organizations of extreme Right are readily availing themselves of the services of anti-Sovieteers. In the U.S., "information" about the Soviet Union in the spurious interpretations of "Ukrainology" is circulated through the Manion Forum directed by the members of the pro-fascist John Birch Society and the Georgetown University Forum Network reflecting the positions of the Pentagon hawks, etc.

Falsified presentation of the state of ethnic relations in the U.S.S.R. is most intensely used in foreign-beamed political broadcasting. That is because imperialist elements see broadcasting services as the major channel through which to bring their ideas home to the people of Socialist countries.

One fact to prove that the war on the air waves is regarded as a very effective instrument of interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union has been the launching and recurrent extension of special machinery created in the post-war period to play up "Ukrainian" topics in international political propaganda. For instance, the launching of the Ukrainian programme over the Voice of America late in 1949 came in unison with the start of direct subversive action by American services on the territory of the Ukrainian Republic [93]. Pronouncements by pseudo-scientific "experts", trained for "national radio programmes" by American university centres for the study of the U.S.S.R., have since become a standing practice. The notorious Radio Liberty, a C.I.A. radio station, which also has the liberty to indulge in its own interpretations of current events and history of the Ukraine, owes its origin to Washington's Cold War plans. It is not for nothing that some even in the U.S. Congress should have

found, in the '70s, that this centre of radio piracy as well as its analogue, Radio Free Europe, were the "relics of the Cold War" [94]. An even more specific description to this effect has been made by a Western expert on international political broadcasting, J. Hale, who concludes that the purpose of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe is "to change the political situation in the target countries" by "indirect methods" [95].

The "Ukrainian Office" of Radio Liberty is one of the places of convergence of the interests of the C.I.A., the Pentagon and Sovietological centres. Communication with those centres is maintained, notably, through the station's central research department which is in direct contact with the academic community" [96]. Government bodies and "research" centres operate as suppliers of "Ukrainological" material to be put on the air and as consumers of information relating to the Ukraine.

A secret report on the operations of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, addressed to the U.S. President and Congress in 1979, pointed out that they intended to keep on using the services of the "research" centres, thereby explaining an allocation of further finance to attract most experienced consultants and students of Russian issues and those of the nationalities of the Soviet Union for co-operation. A conference sponsored by the State Department in Washington in October, 1982, discussed measures to carry through an anti-Socialist "crusade", once more urging active employment of Sovietologists and other members of the stuff of the Institutes for Strategic Studies for propaganda campaigns in conjunction with the Munich-based C.I.A. radio stations.

A number of other Western radio stations have been playing along with the Voice of America and Radio Liberty in using falsified "information" about the Ukrainian Republic. In its turn, Radio Free Europe, in its subversive action against the East European Socialist countries with a view to inciting nationalistic prejudice, has been regularly distorting the historical past and the present mode of life of the Ukrainian people and their relations with the Soviet Union. They are using to this end the disinformation borrowed from the Sovietological "writings" and the press. The pseudoexperts on the Ukraine in the payroll of Western research institutions are working full-scale there to earn the prizes and subsidies they get. In his recollections, the Polish intelligence officer, A. Czechowicz described one of them, B. Osadčuk, who had been supplying the directorate of Radio Free

Europe with secret information and acting as a go-between in getting articles prepared by the station staff published in newspapers of Western countries to be subsequently used by the station as the "opinion" of the press [97].

These and other facts indicate that the deliberate hyperbolization of the national in social development and the bid to galvanize ethnic strife which the victory of Socialism in the country has put an end to betrays the typical image of imperialist radio propaganda based on the false postulates of Sovietology. Public protests in various countries, including the capitalist ones, against the use of broadcasting services for the prosecution of "psychological warfare" invite a typical reaction precisely from those quarters that are involved in the imperialist machinery of political and ideological subversion. They, above all, licensed Sovietologists, are trying at whatever cost to whitewash the subversive stations by claiming them to be needed for "international cultural exchanges." For example, Professor of History Robert Byrnes of Indiana University, one of the pillars of American Sovietology, has set out to prove that the said radio centres "provide objective and accurate information" about the events in Socialist countries [98]. Such declarations in "defence" of the Voice of America, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, and others like them indicate that imperialism continues to regard the propaganda of anti-Communism as an instrument of their struggle against actual Socialism and as an instrument of interference in the sovereign affairs of the peoples of other countries.

An examination of bourgeois press and broadcasting material makes it certain that Sovietology is the purveyor of misconceptions and misinterpretations of the present and the past of the Ukraine. The connection of "research" centres with imperialist propaganda machinery has its specific impact on the character of the media engaged in this mass propaganda — their bid to make their utterances look like "historical and scientific" background and to use references to the "works" and "opinions" of Sovietologists and "experts" on ethnic relations in this context. As Herbert Aptheker, who had analyzed the system of anti-Sovietism in the U.S., has aptly remarked once, hired scribblers are daily and hourly spreading through the press, radio and television the "elaborate mythology of anti-Sovietism..." produced "in 'learned' tomes by academic prevaricators" [99].

* * *

Promoted as it has been in capitalist countries with corporate subsidies, Sovietology does not, however, have a monopoly in the West of interpretations of the history of the Ukraine. A number of problems relating to the history of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic are being studied outside its framework in the U.S. and Canada. These studies are being made, above all, by forces working for peace and international detente, for friendship of the working people of capitalist countries with the peoples of the Soviet Union. Their findings are published in English, Ukrainian and other languages in newspapers and magazines as well as separate books, representing a progressive trend in the American and Canadian historiography of the Ukraine.

The contribution of these forces to historical research consists, first, in elucidating the past history of the Ukrainian people in connection with the study of the history of emigration. Second, in exposing the criminal activities of collaborationists in the Ukrainian lands in recent times, particularly during the Second World War. Finally, it is typical of these forces to be manifestly critical of Sovietology and of the treatises distorting the historical past and the present realities of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Chapter III

HISTORIOGRAPHY AT THE SERVICE OF IMPERIALIST POLICY

The natural laws in operation behind the development of the ideological superstructure make up the major methodological base for an analysis of historical, legal and other concepts and their association with the interests of certain classes. In their examination of bourgeois ideology, the founders of scientific sociology invariably noted that such association does not always make itself felt directly and openly and called for ascertaining the objective role of superstructural elements in society. As V. I. Lenin pointed out, exploiters hire any number of "lawyers, writers, and even parliamentary deputies, professors, parsons and the like". So to bring out the essence of the matter "it is not so important *who* directly advocates particular views, what is important is *who stands to gain* from these views..." [1]

The said principles are of key importance, too, for the evaluation of "Ukrainological" interpretations. Considering what is, as a matter of fact, an unlimited stock of material, it appears to be worth while taking up this objective as exemplified by certain general trends of the post-war Western historiography of the Ukraine, which is basic to the "Ukrainian studies."

1. TO SUIT GEOPOLITICS

One prominent concept that post-war bourgeois writings have been using as an instrument by which to probe the Ukraine's past and present is the so-called "Europeism", i. e., an investigation of the history of the Ukrainian people as part of the history of Europe. There is no need for any particular evidence to prove this contention, and yet they have been going out of their way to play up and emphasize this "Europeism".

To bring out the objective meaning of this trend, one has to analyze imperialist policy in connection with the attempts made to provide an ideological "rationale" for it. It may be

recalled that in the closing stages of the Second World War certain quarters set about working out plans for the establishment of U.S. world supremacy which, in turn, galvanized one pseudo-science — geopolitics. Indicative in this respect was the symposium organized in 1944 with a view to promoting "vital applications of today's geography to the politics and strategy of the United States" in the post-war world. In summing up the proceedings of the symposium, E. Walsh of Georgetown University, while enlarging on "American geopolitics," called for it to be anti-Soviet-oriented in foreign policy. He set out his arguments in what are typical expressions for geopoliticians: fighting the U.S.S.R. was inevitable because "Moscow lies much nearer to the pulse of Eurasia, India, and China than do London and Washington" [2].

Taking the social and economic structural changes in a number of countries of Eastern Europe and the consolidation of the international prestige of the U.S.S.R. to be passing developments, imperialist elements counted on weakening the positions of Socialism. They floated such slogans as "United Europe" and "European Integration", couched in terms of the geopolitical doctrine. The effect this line had in historiography was its accent on the "Europeist" patterns of the history of the peoples of Eastern Europe. In a paper delivered at a conference of the American Historical Association in December, 1946, Professor O. Halecki of Fordham University called for East European peoples to be learned in isolation from "Russian history" [3]. At the same time, there appeared some publications across the Atlantic which treated the history of the Ukraine from the "new European" positions, stressing the argument that the Ukrainians had long been fighting "for their due share and membership in the European community of nations" [4]. This claim was presented, however, as no more than an excuse for the allegation that the Ukrainian people were opposed to the Russian who supposedly, had nothing to do with Europe. In a review of Western literature on the Ukraine in *A Handbook of Slavic Studies* at the same time, O. Frederiksen pointed out that the so-called "school of Central Europeanists", opposed to the "Russian school" in historiography, was used in Western publications "to the advantage of Ukrainian nationalism" [5].

Across the Atlantic, "Europeanist" concepts were brought up following the re-emergence of the organizations of Ostforschung in West Germany, which was seen as the outpost of the "European geostrategy" of U.S. imperialism. As early as the late 1940s, Ostforscher studies were filled

with "Ukrainological" interpretations which were propagated, above all, by the reconstituted Munich-based "German Ukrainian Society" founded by the ideologues of Pan-Germanism in 1918. It proclaimed the "study of the Ukrainian question" in connection with "contemporary European problems" as a policy objective for the post-war period [6].

Such formulations were used to cover up the hopes for an imperialist annexation of Socialist countries. Former Nazi "orientalists", entrenched in West Germany, put forward a slightly updated argument of fascist geopolitics which presented the Ukraine as a "natural" agrarian adjunct to the Powers of Western Europe (the Nazi version referred to Germany). "It would considerably strengthen the economic independence of Europe (meaning its Western part — Ed.)", Professor D. Dyminsky of the Ukrainian Free University wrote, "to include the Ukraine as a source of agricultural produce" [7]. These postulates echoed the contentions of West German geopoliticians. Heinrich Sander pointed out in his book *Europa ohne Phrase* that the essence of the demand for "living space" was in "annexing the Ukraine's feed-producing centre to Middle Europe." The activities of the "German-Ukrainian Society" showed such interpretations to be designed to justify expansionist policies in respect of the U.S.S.R. It is not by chance that reports on the Ukraine's "European function" should have been made at its sessions by revenge-seekers and their yes-men — Third Reich quislings who wanted the European continent to be converted into "one military territory" [8].

It is indicative that a reactionary publicist, P. Rohrbach a well-known ideologue of Prussian fascist "Drang Nach Osten" expansionism, became the leading figure of the "German Ukrainian Society." One of the main arguments in his writings was the geopolitical theory he had advanced back in 1915 as a case for the German claims in the East: "One that holds Kiev, can subdue Russia". For many years he had been an adviser to the top leadership of imperialist Germany on Ukrainian affairs. In 1952, this "Ukrainologist" was elected "honorary President" of the society. Among those who handed a "message of congratulations" to the ideologue of imperialist expansionism were members of the UAAS and other pseudo-scientific organizations as well as representatives of the Uniate clergy [9].

"Mixed" societies patterned on the "German Ukrainian" were set up also in such NATO countries as Holland and Portugal at the height of the Cold War. At the same time, members of those organizations — ward politicians and reac-

tionary professors unequivocally pointed out that their "sympathy" for the Ukraine "is a potent psychological weapon which... may prove to be an invisible NATO" in the struggle against the U.S.S.R.[10] There were "historical studies" made to fit in with imperialist plans of that kind. The "Italian-Ukrainian Society", founded in 1951, raised the money to produce a book by W. Fedoronczuk under the ambitious title *The Ukrainian Problem in the Light of History* (1952 and 1955). In an effort to please the most belligerent elements obsessed with their plans for the "rollback of Communism" on the European continent, he contended that "the Ukraine is one of the main issues of Eastern Europe" [11].

With Cold War acts expanding, the interpretations of "Europeanism" began extensively using the propaganda stock-in-trade of the Third Reich. Many "Ukrainologists" had worked out the methods of that propaganda while collaborating with the fascist occupation press. In particular, the "Europeist" arguments it preached were designed to justify Hitler's aggression and the reign of terror against the working people of the Ukraine. The lieutenants of Nazism were re-writing the history of the social and political development of the Ukraine and its culture. One of them, Y. Boiko, who collaborated in the occupationist *Nova Ukraina* newspaper and fled in the wake of the Nazi troops to Munich, claimed that the "slogan of orientation towards the culture of Western Europe" had become a "lodestar" for the Ukrainian intellectuals. What he referred to, of course, was not the progressive and democratic trends in West European culture, but the writings of the advocates of German militarism inherited by the Nazis. The intellectually hollow regime of genocide was qualified as a "healthy Europe" and the readers were urged to "make" the ideological postulates of fascism "their own". "Scientific papers" produced in Germany proper distorted history to suit the theories of Pan-Germanism and the Hitler Reich's claims to the lands of the Soviet Ukraine. That was also the tenor on the German-language books by D. Doroshenko, *The Ukraine and the Reich* and by A. Yakovliv *German Law in the Ukraine and its Influence on Ukrainian Law in the 16th to 18th Centuries.*

With the Second World War over, the interpretations of "Europeism" began to be garnished with ideas opposing the Ukrainian people to the Russian. Accordingly, the falsifiers enlarged on the Ukrainian people's "gravitation" towards "European civilization" which they held to be synonymous with the concept of "capitalism". That was the line of reaso-

ning that a former Hitler historiographer, B. Krupnycky followed in his treatise *The Ukraine Between the West and the East*, published in Munich in 1957...

The trend to use the "Europeist" concepts made itself quite obvious, furthermore, in the elaboration of the new imperialist tactics following the failure of the doctrines of "containment" and "liberation." The emphasis in them was, as before, on the annexation of European Socialist countries, which followed from the designs of the most aggressive groups of present-day imperialism to "re-fight" the historic battles of the 20th century, take revenge, and throw Socialism back from the summits of world influence.

Significantly, foreign publications on the history of the Ukraine continued to be stuffed with "Europeist" concepts in order to keep alive the shopworn scheme designed to set the historical destinies of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples against each other. The main object of that propaganda was to preach the idea of a "European" people (Ukrainians) as opposed to the supposedly "Asiatic" or "Euroasiatic" (Russians). It is necessary to know that this interpretation is traceable to the ideology of the German expansionists of the 19th century.

While disguising their interpretations as "Eurocentrism" Sovietologists set about galvanizing the anti-historical view of Kievan Rus' as a "Ukrainian State." Those falsifications were not, however, a simple rehash of the earlier theories long since rejected by science. They were aimed at reviving what had proved to be inconsistent "Norman theory" of the origin of Rus'. Typical "modernized" formulas in this respect are to be found in the publications of N. Chirovsky of Seton-Hall University. In his ambitious paper, defying the facts of history, he described Kievan Rus' as a State of "Ukrainian-Norse (Varangian) origin" [12]. In the '70s, neo-Normanism was advanced as basic to a research study by the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. It was sponsored by O. Pritsak who tried in his lecture "The Origin of Rus'" to get across the far-fetched argument about the decisive role of the Normans in Eastern Slavonic nation-building, in the promotion of trade among them, and so on [13]. That latest advocacy of the Normans had been prompted by their treatment as representatives of "Europe" personifying links with a "Ukrainian-Varangian State".

To try and "justify" the isolation of the Ukraine, reactionary historiography has been most widely using interpretations of the period prior to the Ukraine's re-union with Russia. It did so by way of passing over Ukrainian — Rus-

sian co-operation, and playing up the links of Ukrainian lands with the neighbouring countries in the West. A Harvard University review of "the present state of Ukrainian studies" treated historians to the following guideline: "For almost four hundred years (beginning from 1240) the two Rus' had gone their own ways, uninterested in one another. They did not meet until 1654" [14].

Those who made such statements appeared not to have been in the least embarrassed by the fact that public record offices both in the U.S.S.R. and abroad keep a wealth of documentary evidence about the close links between the Ukraine and Russia in the period under review, and that much of that evidence was published back in the last century [15]. Evidence of extensive connections and co-operation between the two sister nations has formed part of fundamental writings on the history of our country [16] and of special monographic studies [17]. The record of history furnishes irrefutable proof to show that the Ukraine's reunion with Russia came after centuries of their economic, political and cultural exchanges and reflected their common yearning for unity.

It is indicative that Western historians who do not allow themselves to be misled by the dogmas of "Europeism" acknowledge the close links that had existed between Russia and the Ukraine long before their reunion. For instance, speaking about the participation of Ukrainian Cossacks in Russia's war against Levonia, Professor H. Hattenbach of the City College of the City University of New York pointed out that "the Moscovite-Cossack alliance lasted until 1561" and that in the preceding period "the Cossacks fought side by side with Moscovite contingents" against foreign conquerors [18].

Following the "Europeist" pattern, Western scholars have been particularly zealous in re-writing the history of Ukrainian culture, purging its history of the evidence of numerous links with the culture of the Russian people, picking and playing up only such facts as, in their judgement, can serve to make the case for undivided "West European influence" on the cultural and intellectual development of the Ukrainian people. In consequence, Ukrainian culture, which is, first and foremost, a product of the development of the Ukrainian people, has been presented in many foreign publications as truncated beyond recognition. For instance, *The New Encyclopaedia Britanica*, published by the University of Chicago, presents the Ukraine's cultural history of the centuries that have gone by as nothing but a succession of "West European influences" in fine arts, theatre, music, and

other arts [19]. At the same time, the Encyclopaedia makes no mention at all of the life-giving connections with advanced Russian letters and art which increased notably upon the Ukraine's reunification with Russia.

While laying emphasis on West European cultural links, exponents of Western politicized historiography have been trying to blur over their class essence. They have drawn a black-and-white picture of everything that has come from the West in the course of the centuries gone by and lumped together the reactionary and progressive trends, giving preference to anti-people developments. Sovietology is invariably treating with piety the Uniate theory, describing it as a sign of the "Europeism" of the Ukraine in the cultural field. For instance, they have picked documents for publication out of the Vatican Record Office so as to "prove" the Ukraine's gravitation towards Catholic Europe. The Vatican's eastward drive, known to have entailed grave consequences for the Ukrainian people, has been presented as one of "the main 'waves' of the European spirit", and wrongly identified with the dissemination of the humanistic ideas of Renaissance and Enlightenment [20]. Finally, what shows up the truly class-inspired substance of the concept of "West European influence" in bourgeois historiography is that it "overlooks" all contact between the working people of the Ukraine and progressive forces in Central and Western Europe.

The misinterpretation of the problem of cultural contacts logically leads the proponents of the concepts of pseudo-Europeism to nihilism in respect of Ukrainian culture itself which one can clearly see in the version of "multi-element" connection, advanced by Trans-Atlantic and West European writers, which means crossing out the Ukrainian people's contribution towards the storehouse of world culture and presenting their intellectual heritage as a mechanical mixture of Latin, German, Uniate, Protestant and other "European elements". Even the "Turkish model" has been put on the list [21]. At the same time, there is no mention of any enrichment of Ukrainian culture due to its contact with Russian culture over the centuries.

A particular feature of such interpretations is an attempt to present the past history of the Russian people as having been isolated from direct contact with the general trends of European culture. "Ukrainologists" have been passing over the fact that ever since the 14th century the Moscow State had direct cultural links with West European countries and that Russian people came to learn more and more about the

cultural achievements of other peoples right in German and Italian cities, in Hungary, Czechia, Poland, Serbia and other countries.

Helpful to the objectives of geopolitics has been speculation on the concept of "cultural boundaries of Europe", which has long been present in reactionary historiography and has a number of interpretations complete with certain "geographic" variations. Post-war Western "Ukrainology," based on arguments that hold no water, gives preference to those interpretations which belittle the role of great Russian culture. In this sense, it is of a piece with the pseudoscientific interpretation of the concept of "cultural boundaries of Europe." That was, for example, the tenor of a report by W. Janiw about the "Eastern boundaries of intellectual Europe," delivered before an "academic audience" in Salzburg in 1979. The author maintained that these boundaries coincided with the "Eastern borders of the Ukraine." He wanted his wishful thinking explained from the positions of ethnopsychology, claiming the Ukrainian people to be "individualistic" as distinct from the "East" where the nations are committed to "collectivist" thinking. The object behind all that speculation about individualism, identified as it is in bourgeois theories with a capitalist mode of life, is to "justify" the commitment of an entire nation to the structure of exploitative society. While playing up the "Europeist" concepts to ascribe to the Ukrainian people an "individualistic philosophy", supposedly influenced by "wide steppes, fertile soil, and Hellenic traditions of long-standing" (typical stock-in-trade of geopolitics!), the author of *An Introduction to Ukrainian History*, which appeared in the U.S. in 1981, made no bones about his objective of vindicating the "principle of private property." That was the reason behind the falsification itself, claiming that the said principle is... "inherent" in the Ukrainian people! [22] That copious treatise left no room for an analysis of truly determining factors of historical development — social and economic. Reactionary "Ukrainologists," as one can see from their geopolitical writings, are ready and willing to tell you any nonsense, to slander the people, just to extoll the "eternity" of the capitalist order with its principles of exploitation and oppression of working people.

2. RECORD OF SOCIALISM IN THE DISTORTING MIRROR OF SOVIETOLOGY

In the present stage of world development, distinguished as it is by the creation and consolidation of a new social and economic type of society, the problems of a switch-over by peoples and nations to a Socialist track become increasingly relevant and important. Recent history provides ample evidence to bear out the justice of V. I. Lenin's words that "Socialism contains within itself gigantic forces and that mankind had now entered into a new stage of development of extraordinarily brilliant prospects" [23].

Anxious to build prosperous national economies, many States have been turning to the historic experience of the Land of Soviets which has gained impressive achievements in various areas of social development within a historically short space of time.

In this context, imperialist reaction looks upon the very history of the Soviet Union as its most dangerous opponent. No wonder that, along with attempting to counter radical progressive change in the social and economic structures of the former colonial and dependent nations by political and economic expedients, imperialist elements have started intensively encouraging a Sovietological "investigation" of the questions relating to the construction of the foundations of Socialism in the U.S.S.R. in general, and in its individual republics in particular. The availability of a wealth of special Soviet literature on this problem has its effect on the character of Western interpretations. Those who produce them find it useless to go on sticking to their earlier tactics of passing over the unprecedented economic and cultural advance of the Soviets ever since the Great October Socialist Revolution and now see themselves compelled to discuss the subjects raised by the course of world societal development.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic presents a striking example of a rapid change from backwardness to economically and culturally advanced positions. In a matter of years, a republic that had inherited a backward economic structure from its past history and suffered terrible devastation in the course of a destructive Civil War and imperialist invasion, achieved what was an unprecedented upsurge in the many centuries of its history.

The working people of the Ukraine, just as those of the rest of the Soviet Union, had to overcome formidable difficulties and to be among the trail-blazers in building a new

type of society — one without exploitation and oppression. That historical experience, being far more than an asset of the past, has been generating active interest in the countries which have broken the chains of imperialism and colonialism and opted for radical social and economic change.

Soon after the Second World War ended, Sovietological centres began producing works with interpretations of events relating to the Ukraine's change-over from a pluralist to a Socialist economy. In subsequent years, there appeared doctoral dissertations as well as monographs devoted specifically to individual aspects and local issues of the Ukraine's history under review. One should note that works by bourgeois historians about earlier or later stages of the history of Soviet society have been more and more often referring to the recovery period, industrialization, introduction of co-operative farming, and other aspects of the Ukraine's development in the inter-war period. All that goes to show that Western publications on the building of Socialism in the Ukraine have presented a diversity of what claim to be scientific explanations of the problem involved.

One of the subjects thus treated is the economic recovery of 1921-1925. In one way or another, many Western authors have been indicating the starting point of this recovery — repairing the "devastation" caused to the Ukraine by the Civil War and imperialist intervention [24]. That had to be done before and along with the actual effort to build the foundations of Socialism.

Considering that the Republic had to start that recovery as good as from scratch, the change that took place in the course of that period cannot be qualified as anything short of amazing. Ukrainian industry, which lay prostrate for all intents and purposes, as recently as 1921, surpassed its prewar level in the space of five years. The gross grain harvest in 1925 was 91 per cent of the average annual grain output in the five years immediately preceding the war, while the sugar-beet yield rose to 17.7 tonnes as against 15.9 tonnes in 1913. Working people's well-being increased. Notable headway was made in cultural development [25]. It is important, in this context, to bear in mind that everything was going on in the face of a strained international situation, economic and diplomatic pressure from imperialist States, counter-revolutionary rebellions and subversion.

The effort made in overcoming that economic disarray has been touched on by bourgeois writers only as much as they saw it necessary to answer questions regarding the rebuilding of industry and transport services that had been

lying in ruins. This effort, as Sovietologists had to admit, produced what they described as "the almost unbelievable economic recovery in the Ukraine, under the NEP from practically total destruction to unprecedented economic health." They have also noted the "phenomenal progress" in the rebuilding of the Ukraine's agriculture [26].

However, all those confessions have not been designed to bring out the true reasons behind the rapid Ukrainian economic upturn. The intention behind them was entirely different. While speaking of industrial and agricultural expansion, Western authors have never missed a chance to point out that it all happened in the context of NEP. While refraining from an integrated assessment of the New Economic Policy, which was a means to strengthen the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, they lay emphasis only on one aspect of that policy — a certain revival of private enterprise in small-scale industry and commerce in the opening stages of that policy. There was a certain reason behind that kind of interpretation — it was to try and put down the results achieved in the Republic's economic recovery to the activities of capitalist elements [27]. That is to say that bourgeois interpreters want to reduce to nought the decisive role that the Socialist sector of the economy and its large-scale industry played in overcoming the disarray [28].

One can see the slanted approach of modern-day advocates of the capitalist system to the evaluation of the reasons behind the economic upturn also in that they do not make any mention in their writings of the re-emergence of forces hostile to Socialism, which damaged the Republic's economy — the kulak backlash, sabotage by some bourgeois specialists, and anti-social tactics of private property interests.

The trend to misconstrue the essence and the character of NEP has been followed up by the attempts of Sovietologists to investigate the subsequent process of dislodging capitalist elements out of the economic system and passing over to the first five-year plans. There is no hint in their writings at the fact that private capital was increasingly playing a disorganizing role as time went on, causing economic difficulties and subverting the institutional policy of supervision and regulation. Some American writers, noting the elimination of the capitalist order of things in the Ukraine and in the rest of the Soviet Union, declared that to be an "abolition" of NEP. This artificial chronicling (B. Dmytryshyn considers NEP confined to 1921-1928) and the inconsistency of argument in trying to prove it have been a di-

rect consequence of their refusal to recognize that NEP was a policy of building Socialism, designed, as V. I. Lenin stressed, for the entire period of transition [29]. Consequently, the concept of "abolition" of NEP has been intended to misrepresent the essence of the New Economic Policy and to cross out all of its subsequent stages which saw an industrialization programme carried out, co-operative farming established, and the Socialist economic system coming to stay unchallenged.

The far-fetched characterization of the recovery period caused bourgeois historiography to misinterpret yet another major problem of those years — the revival of the Donetsk coal-mining industry. While admitting that it took a very short space of time to complete, Sovietology has been ignoring the true facts behind so rapid a recovery. It appears to "forget" all about its own acknowledgement of the far-reaching devastation in the Ukraine, and seeks to present the Donetsk revival as being due to a mustering up of the efforts and resources of a single Republic.

Western "Ukrainologists" won't tell you that it was the nation as a whole that raised the Donetsk coal-fields from ruins and that the "Everything for Donbas!" slogan was an appeal to all the Soviet Republics to contribute their material and manpower resources. Working people of the Russian Federation and Byelorussia, sometimes forgoing the very essentials, sent machines, equipment, foodstuffs and manufactured goods to the workers of the Donetsk coal-fields. Thousands of skilled workers came down from Moscow, Petrograd, and other cities, regions, and republics, to rebuild the Donetsk collieries. That is to say that workers of Soviet Russia and other Republics contributed not only their material resources, but their own labour force as well to bring the Ukraine's coal-mining industry back to life. Donbas was not the only example of the concerted labour effort of the emergent Soviet Republics. The disastrously damaged rail transport of the Ukraine was also rebuilt with the help of the sister Russian nation. To speed up its rebuilding, the Ukraine received some locomotives from Siberia, metal from the Urals, and so on [30]. That participation could not but inspire the enthusiasm of Ukrainian working people themselves. The rapid recovery effort in the Ukraine had a favourable effect on the economic and cultural resurgence of this Republic as well as of the rest of the nation.

One issue that came up in close association with national economic recovery was that of a still closer joining of

efforts by the Soviet Republics in every area of co-operation. That was the period that saw the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics formed. It had the effect of speeding up the nation's social and economic advance. No country has ever done so much for the all-round advancement of so many ethnic communities in so short a time as the U.S.S.R. Soviet experience in building up the multi-ethnic Socialist State has won world-wide recognition and come to serve as an inspiring example for all peoples in battle for social and national liberation.

The ideologists of the exploitative system have for decades been uneasy over the very fact of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics having been formed, in the first place. They have been saying a lot of things about the Ukraine's membership of one federal State. Yet they have to twist and turn more and more often because even some bourgeois publications recognize the favourable effect the unification of the Soviet Republics has had on their subsequent development (as E. Carr and R. Portal).

Unable to pass over this major event, Sovietologists have been straining every nerve to misrepresent the reasons behind the federation of the Ukraine with the R.S.F.S.R. and other republics. The quintessence of their "studies" has been the contention about an "artificial" (some interpreters call it "forcible") character of the Ukraine's incorporation in a federal multi-ethnic State (omitting to mention, however, that the Ukraine was one of those who had sponsored the unification movement) [31].

A more disguised but, in point of fact, similar intent to discredit the voluntary principle behind the establishment of the U.S.S.R., is to be found in the false concept of centralization and unification devised by "Ukrainologists". They invoke it to support the allegation of a "struggle" between the Ukraine and the "centre" and, in the long run, the claim that the effect of the Ukraine's incorporation in the Union has been to "strip" her of her sovereign rights. While speculating on the Ukraine's "defeat" supposedly consequent upon the formation of the U.S.S.R., bourgeois historians never say anything about the connection between the sweeping accomplishments of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in every area of life and her all-round close co-operation with the sister republics within an integrated federal State.

In their version of the history of the "federal links" between the Ukraine and the R.S.F.S.R., Sovietology has been offering to interpret them as the desire of the Bolsheviks to achieve centralization right from their power take-over

in Petrograd. It argues that all of the Ukraine's post-October development has been under the influence of some demonic forces that wanted to bring the Republic into submission through "centralization" and "unification". Incidentally, there are writers who juggle with this kind of terminology whenever they have to say something about the actual unity and concerted efforts of the Soviet Republics. While mystifying history, they pretend to know nothing about any armed invasion of the newborn Soviet Republics by imperialist States or about any threat of subsequent invasions.

That is to say bourgeois historiography leaves altogether out of account the historical background to the Ukraine's joining the federation, internal and international factors. Its adepts "forget" to mention that it is the international situation and the problems of Socialist development in the Ukraine as well as in the other Soviet Republics that actually required their ever closer relationship and co-operation. Lenin referred to that connection in no uncertain terms when he said that "it is necessary to strive for ever closer federal unity, bearing in mind, first, that the Soviet Republics, surrounded as they are by the imperialist Powers of the whole world — which from the military standpoint are immeasurably stronger — cannot possibly continue to exist without the closest alliance; second, that a close economic alliance between the Soviet Republics is necessary, otherwise the productive forces which have been ruined by imperialism cannot be restored and the well-being of the working people cannot be ensured; third, that there is tendency towards the creation of a single world economy, regulated by the proletariat of all nations as an intergal whole and according to a common plan..." [32]. Striving for closer unity and co-operation between the Ukraine and the other sister republics reflected the deep-rooted objective processes of evolution of a new, Socialist type of society, the interests of millions of working people in town and countryside.

It is indicative that Sovietology avoids, as a rule, referring to the unification movement for the establishment of the U.S.S.R. which had developed in the Ukraine and to the way it had progressed. Nor has it ever taken into account the fact that the mass of the people saw it essential for the Ukraine to unite with the sister republics. Whenever Sovietologists refer to the unification movement at all, they do so just to produce some fragmentary information about the signing of isolated official Acts between the Ukraine and the R.S.F.S.R. In doing so they focus your attention on facts detached from their context, which showed how the process

of building the prospective union went on. Falsifiers interpret the free and constructive discussion, typical of Socialist democracy, as a manifestation of "opposition" to the very idea of the unification of the republics within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, laying accent, as a rule, on debatable issues quite natural on the threshold of any major event.

Since the Ukraine's decision to join the federal State is an undeniable fact, politicized historiography has been trying to put it down to the operation of the "higher-ups" — that is, the Party chiefs and the Government. The 7th All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets, which adopted that historic decision, has been declared in Western "writings" to have been a congress that "did not represent the majority of the population" [33]. Such assertions, designed to call in question the authority of the legitimately elected highest body of government in the Ukraine, have been accompanied by allegations that the "union of the republics to form the U.S.S.R. did not proceed as spontaneously and smoothly as had usually been asserted in the Soviet Union" [34]. They refer either to the Communist Party of the Ukraine, or just to the Ukrainians, or to the entire republic as the forces that raised all those obstacles.

There is plenty of documentary evidence and research findings published in the U.S.S.R. to expose the ill faith and partialism of such arguments. These provide full information about the organizing role of the Communist Party and its loyal contingent — the Party Organization of the Ukraine in setting up a Socialist federation [35]. While discharging this function the Party expressed the mood of the mass of the working people and did everything to enable them to grasp the necessity of unification to the fullest possible extent. The establishment of a federal State had been preceded by numerous debates in the Ukraine, as well as in other republics, on what form this prospective federation was to assume. There were all kinds of suggestions made, including erroneous ones. Yet the debate eventually produced a crystallized notion of a new form of national alliance of the Soviet Republics which was scientifically substantiated in Lenin's proposal about the highest type of Soviet federation. That process of looking for the form such national unification was to take was itself an indication that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was the product of an active, free and constructive effort.

At the same time, Soviet historiography has never overlooked the existence of certain elements that were alien to

Socialism and remnants of the overthrown capitalist class in the period in question. These produced organizers of counter-revolutionary conspiracies and bands and anti-Soviet agitators who sought to oppose the Ukraine to the Russian Federation.

While limiting its interest to such subjects, bourgeois historiography avoids any reference to the involvement of the great mass of the people of the Ukraine in the unification movement which got under way in all the Soviet Republics at the time. No reader can ever find anything from its monographs or articles about the Ukrainian working people's attitude to treaty-governed relations and federal structure or about their enthusiasm for the formation of the U.S.S.R. The writers committed to that sort if writing could not be expected to show the scale of the unification movement which was all-embracing, indeed, as one can judge from historical evidence. The discussion of the future of the Republic as well as of the rest of the nation went on at Party and government level, in community organizations, at factory and office meetings and in the press. The will and voice of the masses were reflected in numerous resolutions, decisions and ordinances adopted by the local Soviets and meetings of Communists as well as people outside the Party and in messages of greetings that the provincial Congresses of Soviets sent to the Governments of the R.S.F.S.R. and the Ukraine.

Ukrainian working peasants were an important factor in the unification movement. Western historiography has also been trying to pass over that period because to have admitted the rural labour's involvement in the movement would have disproved the Sovietologists' far-fetched argument about the "hostility" of the Ukrainian peasantry towards the Socialist system. Those of them who claim to know the Ukraine's record of the 1920 have been stubbornly describing the Ukrainian people as a "peasant nation" opposed to the Soviet system of State power. They transpose whatever was peculiar to the kulaks over to the whole mass of the peasantry the vast majority of whom consisted of working peasants who constituted the major base of support the Soviet system of government had in the countryside. It is these sections that were active in the movement for the Soviet Republics to unite within a federal State, as the Chairman of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee, G. I. Petrovsky, who was also the Chairman of the All-Ukrainian Central Committee of Poor Peasants, emphasized in his speech at the opening of the 7th All-Ukrainian

Congress of Soviets on December 10, 1922. He said that the idea of "a closer relationship of the Soviet Republics within an integrated powerful union was developing both at grass-root level — that is, within the mass of the peasantry, and at top level — at the session of the All-Ukrainian Central Executive Committee" [36].

Sovietological treatises omit to mention altogether that it was predominantly peasants that spoke at the very Congress that adopted the historic decision. They also pass over the provincial and district peasant conferences late in 1922 and early in 1923 which also showed the mass of the rural community to approve the Ukraine's decision to join the federation of equal Soviet Republics. For instance, the resolution of a conference of non-Party people in the Gavryshev District of Podolye Region on February 4, 1923, said that the decisions of the 7th All-Russia Congresses of Soviets about the formation of the U.S.S.R. "are a historical necessity and that it is only through the Union of Soviet Republics that the economic and political power of all workers' and peasants' republics can be maintained to fight international capital" [37]. Numerous documents carrying resolutions of peasant congresses in all provinces indicate that the unification was an act approved by the great mass of the people in the Ukraine and that it reflected their hopes and aspirations. These facts make nonsense of the Sovietologists' countless allegations about the Ukrainian people's "opposition" to the unification movement and the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Although a good deal has been written in the West about social and political developments in the Ukraine in the '20s and '30s, those writings do not offer even a rough idea of the basic trends and events. First, this is due to a special selection of subjects intended to play up the operation of exploiter elements against the Soviet system. Second, the action of these forces is seen from the positions of bourgeois apologetics. And, finally, looking at this action is just an excuse to give a misjudged treatment of the system of political organization of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and insinuations regarding the Bolshevik Party.

However, the actual record of economic recovery in the Ukraine, and throughout the rest of the land, provides cogent evidence to prove that the only way the mass of the people can cope with such involved problems in their effort to build a new type of society is by acting under the leadership of a Marxist-Leninist Party guided by the principles of proletarian internationalism. The Central Committee of the

Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) and the Central Committee of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) of the Ukraine, and the local Party organizations inspired and mobilized the working people for rebuilding the ravaged economy and launching a new, Socialist type of culture [38].

While trying to dismiss the titanic effort of the Communists as the vanguard force of the working class and all working people, Sovietologists have been concentrating their attention on the scheming by elements hostile to Socialism.

One of the organizations brought to prominence in bourgeois historiography dealing with the inter-war period in the Ukraine is the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church (UAOC). It has been played up so as to cast aspersions on the Socialist social and political system. Exponents of bourgeois and clerical historiography present the UAOC as a kind of "victim to the regime" and a result of some "struggle" of the Party and government bodies against everything indigenous to the life of the Ukrainian people, trying at the same time to portray the Autocephalous Church as a carrier of Ukrainian native traditions [39]. To import a semblance of "veracity" to their allegations, these interpreters have, in particular, been juggling with figures about a "massive membership" of the UAOC. Of course, they failed to give chapter and verse. Hence a wide diversity of information. For example, the publishers of the Munich *Encyclopaedia of Ukrainology* will assure you that the UAOC had 10,657 clergymen. Those, however, who made the "reference note" about the UAOC for the Toronto encyclopaedia *Ukraine* give you a different maximum figure — "around 1,500" clergymen, including deacons [40].

The whole idea behind this figure juggling is to divert your attention from the true character of the operations of the Autocephalous Church. Those jugglers deem it to be self-evident that the UAOC has been doing nothing beyond ministering to the religous interests of the believers. However, the Autocephalous Church, whose fate they lament, was one of the centres in the '20s that conducted anti-Soviet activities and propaganda under a religious umbrella. Therefore, bourgeois historiography tells you nothing about the kind of people those Autocephalous clergymen were. But the historical documents, published back in the '20s and '30s, exposing the UAOC's unseemly role, show up what foreign "researchers" bashfully pass over. To begin with, this Church organization was the brainchild of the counter-revolutionary Directory (created by the Decree of January 1, 1919). After

the Civil War, the UAOC went all-out to back up the same counter-revolution. The former officers who served under Petlyura and White Guards who failed to escape abroad in good time found action within their "native" Autocephalous Church to be the most convenient way to continue opposing the Soviet system of government in the Ukraine. A selective inspection of 570 UAOC parishes in 1927 showed a total of 354 Czarist army officers and rebels who served under Denikin and Petlyura to be among the ministers of the Church [41].

The things that those individuals did and that are now passed over by Sovietologists were often admitted in those years by UAOC clergymen in their official statements, not to speak of parishioners. The Head of the Church himself Borecky, speaking at the great St. Nicolas Assembly, had to admit that the activities of the Autocephalous Orthodox Church he was in change of had received "purely political, rather than ecclesiastical, direction." He also acknowledged that the clergy was being reinforced by "non-religious people with a dubious record" [42].

The men of Petlyura and other counter-revolutionaries in Church robe were girding their loins for an armed uprising against the Soviet State. The Autocephalous hierarchy transformed their Church into a subsidiary of the underground counter-revolutionary organization "The Union for the Liberation of the Ukraine" (ULU). The trial of ULU members in Kharkov in 1930 showed the Autocephalous Church up in its true colours. However, the modern-day bourgeois advocates pass over this revealing point. To go into detail about the proceedings of that trial would mean citing evidence by the Church leaders themselves and other proof of their connections with the ULU. Therefore, the Trans-Atlantic "experts" on the history of the Ukraine confined themselves to noting that the UAOC has been "charged with collaboration" with the ULU [43]. So you are supposed to believe this to have been nothing but a "charge", while the fact of its having been fully confirmed in the course of the legal proceedings is passed over so as to cast doubt on the involvement of autocephalists in counter-revolutionary scheming against the Ukrainian people's government.

Sovietologists have been using such tactics, notably, in order to give themselves more "leeway" in preaching the false argument about a "ban" on the UAOC in the Ukraine. B. Bociurkiw, the man who has spent so much time turning and twisting the history of the Church in the Ukraine, has

been expressing himself with more subtlety and hypocrisy, claiming that the UAOC "alone was singled out for forcible 'self-dissolution'". Steering clear of the facts which brought the Autocephalists to their downfall, he is seeking the reason where there has been none at all: they, he claims, fell victim to their own effort to propound some "Ukrainization" of Church life[44]. That is an effort to distract attention from the true causes behind the discontinuation of the UAOC's operations when this unit ended up its inglorious career by voluntary self-dissolution in January 1930 at an emergency conclave in Kiev attended by the bishop with Borecky at the head. The activities of the Church were given an assessment which the falsifiers keep silent about also because it is a direct exposure of their constructions. The Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, the resolution of the conclave said, "was a nationalistic political counter-revolutionary organization of the ULU"[45]. These documents show how hypocritical and false have been the interpretations of the foreign advocates of the UAOC and their attempts to denigrate Soviet justice and, along with it, the Socialist system.

An examination of publications which appeared in the West right after the war shows that bourgeois historiography has been using a selective approach, focussing attention on subjects and events which, as its adepts see it, must bear out their concepts and reject Socialism as a system of social progress. Exponents of Sovietology turn to such methods and tactics in an attempt to present their own interpretation of the Socialist industrialization of the Ukraine. The attention they give to the problem of material and technical resources by which to promote social progress — one of the fundamental concepts in social development — is a rather significant indication of its importance in the present-day ideological controversy between Socialism and capitalism. In considering Western "Ukrainological" publications on this subject, one should, about all, note something they do have in common: as distinct from pre-war bourgeois literature, they do not question the creation of extensive industrial capacities in the Republic under the pre-war five-year plans. Moreover, they unequivocally refer to the Ukraine's "phenomenal" economic growth. "As a result of the rapid industrialization of the Ukraine since 1928," said a report by C. Zum-Brunner of the University of Washington, the coal-mining, iron and steel and other heavy industries "have expanded prodigiously. Concomitantly, new branches of Ukrainian

industry have been developed and urbanization has been rapid" [46].

The questions relating to the industrialization of the Republic have become an object of many publications in Western historiography which, apart from acknowledging a whole series of indisputable facts, has been aiming to provide an insight into the deep-seated processes of this phenomenon. That has inevitably made it turn to the factors behind the necessity of the Ukraine's industrialization which bourgeois writers at once claim to betray a negative background. In their publications they view industrialization in isolation from its overriding objective — that of creating the modern material and technical foundations of Socialism. By and large, their treatment of the subject boils down to playing up and interpreting at will only one thing — the measures taken by the Communist Party and the Soviet Government to build up national defence capability. Some bourgeois writers maintain that the whole reason behind the concentration of all effort in the Ukraine's heavy industry and the entire industrialization of the Republic was to make "war preparations". Others, while repeating the argument about the "military" motivation of the industrialization effort, grudgingly admit the existence of a "hostile capitalist encirclement" [47]. Theories of this kind have been readily echoed by falsifiers who have overreached themselves by interpreting any historical evidence as bearing out the imperialist aggressors' stories about a "Soviet military threat".

Sovietology does not provide any more or less satisfactory answer either to the question about the reasons behind the record fast pace achieved in carrying through the industrialization programme. A rather black-and-white explanation of that effort was ventured back in the late '40s. It was the argument that foreigners had played the decisive role in the creation of modern industrial capacities in Kiev, Kharkov, Zaporozhie and other Ukrainian cities. It was, they argued, only due to the co-operation of American engineers that "the Ukraine rapidly became one of the foremost industrialized area in the Soviet Union" [48].

However, a mere review of the facts in question would show such arguments to be altogether unfounded. In early 1932, the Ukraine had more than 84,500 engineering and technical staffs, half of them with higher or specialized secondary education, and close on 6,000 scientists [49] and upwards of 100,000 inventors and rationalizers [50]. It was their growing experience, competence and skill that made it possible to resolve the hardest technological problems of na-

tional economic rebuilding, surpassing foreign models and projects, under the early five-year plans. As to foreigners, there were 9,200 specialists and 10,600 workers throughout the Soviet Union at the time. Besides, their co-operation was rather short-lived and sometimes little effective, so that most of the technical consultation contracts with foreign firms had to be cancelled as early as 1931-1932 [51]. The whole record of the Socialist industrialization effort in the Ukraine is there to show that the major contribution to it was made by factory workers, engineers, technicians and scientists of the Ukraine with all-round assistance from the Russian Federation and other sister Republics to rely on. Now, the Sovietological interpretation of the utilization of technical expertise and specialist manpower from advanced capitalist countries which, as actual experience indicates, played anything but the major role, is designed to divert attention from the advantages of the socialist system which enabled the Ukraine's industrial development to proceed by leaps and bounds under the early five-year plans.

Later publications, encouraged by monopoly corporations, exhibited yet another technique of "covering" the factors of accelerated industrialization and its pace. Sovietologists were more and more often enlarging on the "price" of industrialization and, in that context, focussing attention on a number of points involved in its implementation so as to "justify" their own pre-conceived idea of "unacceptability" of the Socialist methods of creating a modern industrial potential. To "prove" that, they have been ascribing to Socialist industrialization the ways and means that are typical of capitalist industrialization, which is known to turn on the plunder and merciless exploitation of the mass of people in their own countries and of colonial nations.

Starting from the '60s and, particularly, in the '70s bourgeois historiography laid emphasis in its "study" of the industrialization effort in the Ukraine on "regional surveys" dealing with isolated historical and economic problems. They considered quite at length the issue of the material and financial sources of the Ukraine's industrialization. One of the first monographs on the subject to see the light of day in the West was that of Z. Melnyk, dealing with the questions of fixed capital formation in the Republic under the first Five-Year Plan [52]. The author's main purpose was to prove that the Ukraine's industrial investment was built up "mostly" with the savings of the townspeople and the farming community. That theory clearly betrayed what was a typical stratagem of Sovietology, quoting the demand put

forward by the Trotskyites about a heavier tax to be levied on peasants to speed up the industrialization programme. "Ukrainologists" omit to say that this demand was rejected by the Communist Party or to analyze the major source of industrialization -- the capital gains made by a Socialist industry[53].

In their interpretations of the Republic's industrial development, Sovietologists have been giving a good deal of space to "analyzing" and "commenting" on the distribution of financial resources in the '20s and '30s. The purpose behind that kind of "research" has been to try and impose a far-fetched argument in historiography about a "withdrawal" of large amounts of cash from the Ukraine's circulation and its transfer to other regions, so as to misrepresent the purpose and character of all deductions made by the Republic into the national budget and show that to be an "infringement" of its interests. One can find nothing in those bourgeois theories to see that the money from the national budget was used to meet the economic interests of this country as a whole and those of each Republic in particular.

Sovietological arguments about the "financial exploitation" of the Ukrainian Republic to promote the industrialization of the Russian Federation and other Republics hold no water once confronted with the facts it is passing over. Although the Ukraine was an industrially more advanced region compared with other outlying national areas, it got all manner of assistance including assistance in financing its accelerated development, under the early five-year plans. For example, the Central Executive Committee and the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. approved a resolution on December 21st, 1929, providing for 64.3 per cent of the Russian Federation's turnover tax proceeds to go into its budget while the Ukraine had all of its tax proceeds flowing into its budget as did the other republics. What kind of "withdrawal" of the Republic's financial resources can one talk about if, for instance, the one-time tax returns all went into the budget of the Ukrainian Republic, while the Russian Federation had only 54 per cent of its tax proceeds going into the budget[54].

The purpose behind the Western interpretations designed to present Socialist industrialization as a kind of means of "exploiting" the Ukraine has been to distort the Socialist principles of inter-republican and inter-regional economic connections which imply integrally balancing the interests of the parties involved and fraternal mutual assistance bet-

ween them. While claiming that the inter-republican exchange of material values placed the Ukraine "at a disadvantage", Sovietologists have been trying to write off altogether the great contribution towards Ukrainian industrial rebuilding by the Russian Federation and other sister Republics in the preceding recovery period. They have been just as mute about the importance of the establishment of new industrial centres in other Republics for the economic growth of the Ukraine in subsequent years, notably, in the process of its rebuilding after the German occupation of 1941-1944.

It is noteworthy that it is in connection with industrialization that bourgeois writers have found themselves compelled to speak more and more often about the balancing of economic standards of the Republics. From this point of view, they have launched an "investigation" of the Ukraine's history under the first two five-year plans. The balancing of economic development standards naturally implied faster development of backward regions beside the relatively advanced ones (like the Ukraine). It was the starting point in attacking the principle of balancing economic levels. A number of authors in the West have been seeking to prove it to be "inexpedient" by their own "coverage" of the problem of distribution of new industrial centres in this country.

For "evidence", they have been using "economic" calculations of a speculative kind because these mean stressing only one part of the question — the differences in economic performance (like productivity or production cost), naturally arising in the newly created industrial regions, compared with traditional centres. Applying that stratagem, Sovietologists have been insisting that industrial production in the Eastern regions of the Soviet Union was "less effective" than in the Ukraine under the immediate pre-war five-year plans. Contending that the Ukraine's industry "did not receive adequate investment", they make a "discovery" by declaring industrialization to be the cause behind the "slowdown" of the Republic's development[55]. However, what kind of a "slow-down" can one talk about when the average annual growth rate of industrial production in the Ukraine under the Second Five-Year Plan, which I. Koropecky refers to, was 17.4 per cent, as against 17.1 per cent throughout the whole of the U.S.S.R.[56]

This is, in the long run, an attempt to frighten the reader by alleged sacrifices bound to be entailed by a policy of balancing the economic growth levels of the Republics. I. Koropecky purports to present his falsified interpretations of the policy of balancing the economic growth standards of

the U.S.S.R. and, in this context, of the Ukraine's economic development under the early five-year plans "as a lesson for some developing countries"[57]. He "warns", in particular, India and Brazil against borrowing any of the methods of Soviet industrialization. The whole line of reasoning of this Trans-Atlantic "expert" is designed to prove the "benefits" of accelerated development of industrial centres already existing in this country compared with the creation of new ones in other regions. That is veiled advocacy of the capitalist way of industrialization which is known to widen the gap between the advanced state of some regions and the backward state of other regions. One should note that actual experience sweeps away these recommendations. It is precisely in the developing countries that the idea of balancing the economic growth levels of various regions has been winning a growing body of supporters and it has been officially acknowledged by a number of international organizations.

The Sovietological arguments about the "inacceptability" of the Socialist way of industrialization are easily disproved by the actual results achieved in the process of its implementation, which brought the Ukraine up to the level of the world's industrially advanced nations in a wide range of major aspects of economic performance within a historically short space of time. For instance, Ukrainian engineering, which had become the Republic's leading industry, accounted for 22 per cent of her gross industrial output as early as 1932, surpassing the U.S., Britain, Germany and other advanced countries in this area. In 1937, the Ukraine was leading the world in mechanized coal-mining, coming ahead of Britain, the U.S. and France[58].

Yet another bid of a piece with the attempts to cross out the international significance of the experience of Socialist industrialization has been to misinterpret the history of co-operative farming in the Ukraine. Through differing in a way on some particular aspects of the matter in question, the Sovietologists taking up this subject are generally unanimous and perhaps are even at one in denying the objective necessity of re-shaping agricultural production in line with Socialist principles. They proclaim this conclusion of theirs without taking into account the actual state of things in the farming community before a full-scale campaign of Ukrainian peasants to join collective farms began. Isolated attempts at making such an analysis turn out to have been a totally sham enterprise. For instance, J. Mace, in an article about the Ukrainian peasantry, claimed that in the

period under review the kulak (rich farmers') households were the main productive force in the countryside[59]. Hence the conclusion that there were no prerequisites for co-operative farming to be total and for the kulak households to be eliminated. In the same way the author avoids scientifically analyzing statistics, which reveal an entirely opposite tendency and indicate that back in the 1926/27 economic year, most of the grain put on the market came from the state farms, collective farms, and middle peasants, while all the kulak households produced was 20 per cent[60].

One will be wasting one's time trying to find any mention in bourgeois publications of how the kulaks sabotaged grain procurements, grain and meat deliveries, etc. from year to year. Such an approach to covering the position in the Republic's agriculture was imbued with a class-inspired whitewashing attitude to the kulaks as the vehicles of the "immutable" private ownership of the means of production which received a devastating blow with the introduction of a new and more productive system of farming.

Western misinterpreters explain the urgency of co-operative farming in the Ukraine by nothing but extra-economic factors, thereby twisting the whole issue. Ignoring the actual state of farming connected with the inability of small-scale commodity production to meet the rising demand for foodstuffs due to the rapid growth of industrial centres, they find, without any experience to bear them out, that the main reason behind social and economic restructuring of the countryside was the "hostility" of the science of Marxism-Leninism towards the peasantry. That leads to the Communist Party's entire agrarian policy being treated as one directed against the crop farmers[61]. In a bid to prove it, "Ukrainologists" pass off the nihilism towards the peasantry on the part of Trotskyite opposition, which the Bolsheviks were adamantly up against, for the Leninist general strategy.

While basing themselves on their own far-fetched argument about the absence of valid economic reasons behind the reform of the agricultural sector, such authors garnish their writings with references to the "forcible" character of the institution of co-operative farming[62]. To "prove" it, they refer to what was a breach of the Party's instructions about the unfailing observance of the voluntary principle in setting up collective farms and to the abuse of power by certain local authorities in introducing co-operative farming on a massive scale. One simple fact to show how "objective" historians of that kind been in considering this complex process is that only isolated publications referred, and even

they did it just in passing, to the resolution of March 14th, 1930, by the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party *On Action to Check Deviations from the Party Line in the Co-operative Farming Movement*, which said the voluntary principle must never be allowed to be violated.

Accordingly, Sovietologists have been inclined to characterize the Ukrainian peasantry of the period in question as an integral mass. Although they do use the terms "kulaks", "middle peasants", and "poor peasants" in their monographs, yet they present the rural exploiters and the sections of working peasantry opposing them as exponents of kulak ideology and mentality. The "arguments" they bring forward turn on deliberate focussing of attention on factors which arose in the course of the process of introduction of co-operative farming when groups of middle and poor peasants fell under the influence of provocative kulak propaganda in some places. In this connection, Western publications quite often rehash the historically known facts of slaughter of livestock that was in the private possession of the peasants who joined the collective farms [63]. Even collective farms themselves were declared to be "centres of opposition" on the grounds that there was some wrecking activity on some of them by the kulaks that had infiltrated them without ever giving up their hostile intention with regard to public property.

It is with an unmistakable show of irritation that Sovietology has been telling its own story about the abolition of the kulaks as a class, showing them to be "victims" of the Socialist system. It has been quite grandiloquent in creating a kind of halo of glory for rural exploiters, without hesitating to call them "progressive" elements in the countryside [64]. In some works, written from extreme tendentious positions, the abolition of the kulakdom in the Ukraine was interpreted as a case of physical removal. Sovietologists say nothing at all about the fact that the men of that class were granted a guaranteed opportunity by the State for reforming themselves and becoming honest workers.

Quite an effort has been made in the U.S. and some other Western countries to give battle to Soviet science on the upshot of co-operative farming. A number of foreign "experts", never bothering to make anything like in impartial analysis of the statistics and factual evidence relating to the Ukrainian countryside, have, instead, turned their limelight on the difficulties and errors that arose in the actual process of introduction of co-operative farming. They devote a good deal of space in their publications to all

manner of wishful thinking, notably, regarding the food problems that cropped up in some areas of the Ukraine in 1932-1933. In doing so, they have discounted the actual reasons behind such developments, as the lack of experience in organizing production on most of collective farms, subversive activities by the surviving kulaks, and just drought in some areas. Only occasionally do they mention certain hindrances in the way of effective progress in setting up the system of co-operative farming. For example, R. Sullivant admits in his monograph the influence of unfavourable climate conditions on crop yields and the subversive action of exploiter elements against collective farms [65].

However, "Ukrainologists" have never given up their top ambition to prove the "artificial" character of what they describe as "centrally" created food difficulties. In defiance of all facts, such Sovietologists as D. Dalrymple and G. Hudson, claim that the peasants were left totally unaided [66]. They build their contentions on rumours and unchecked "eye-witness accounts", while ignoring as much as they can the historical documents of those years which show what vigorous action was taken by the Communist Party to cope with the situation that had developed in the countryside. It was not only the local and republican organizations that were engaged in that effort. A loan of seeding stock, food and fodder, 35 million poods (one pood is equal to a little over 16 kg) was granted as urgent aid to the Republic by decision of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Government of the U.S.S.R. in the spring of 1933. Besides, 15,000 tractors, 2,400 combine harvesters, and 3,000 motor vehicles were turned over to the collective farms, State farms and machine-and-tractor stations of the Republic on instructions from the Central Party and government bodies, which helped quickly resolve the problem that had arisen [67].

Of course, there was some deliberate action to stop working people from getting food supplies. That action was masterminded and executed by the remnants of the abolished exploiter classes, above all, the former kulaks who resorted to new ways and methods of struggle against the Socialist system, by infiltrating collective farms and even worming their way into positions of responsibility in some cases. As stated by the Twelfth Congress of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, which met from January 18 to 23, 1934, "the kulaks, fighting the collective farms, have organized widespread stealing and misappropriation of collective farm property." Taking advantage of managerial inexpe-

rience needed to run big farms, they resorted to acts of provocation to wreck deliveries and disrupt the food supply to the rural population.

It should be underlined that Sovietology would like to present the difficulties that did arise as a scourge that afflicted the whole of the Ukraine's farming industry. In actual fact, many regions of the Republic, like those of Donetsk, Poltava, and march-land territories, avoided that scourge. While gathering the same harvest as many other regions, they, "having raised the business of farming and organization of work on collective farms to a high level of quality, succeeded in turning in appreciably greater grain procurements than other regions did, while assuring the interests of their own collective farmers at the same time"[69].

The falsifiers' "findings" about the "exploitation" of the Ukrainian peasantry and their "worsening" condition sounded like sheer nonsense beside the overall triumph of co-operative farming in the Ukraine. It is collective-farm production that became the major factor in raising the peasants' standard of living. As early as 1937 the collective farmers got 4.4 times as much grain and 4.1 times as much cash per work-day unit as they did in 1932[70]. The contentions of Sovietologists run counter even to the admissions that find their way into bourgeois historiography itself, like, say, the acknowledgement of a rise in the Ukrainian peasants' standard of living by as early as the mid-1930s[71].

There is one more thing that has become an object of wishful thinking for those who preach anti-Communism. It is the effort the Communist Party and the Government made to promote the Ukraine's cultural advance. In the early '20s, the Party launched a great campaign to promote the knowledge of the Ukrainian language and cultural progress. Some students in the West have noted that this was a general strategy in operation throughout the land. "The central authority", said E. Carr in his work, "had never extended any preference or privilege ... to the Great Russians." Quoting appropriate official documents, he notes that the statement they contained to that effect "was not unfounded"[72]. However, there are some entirely different evaluations cohabiting with these in the same historiography. Some "Ukrainian study" centres treated the Party and government moves to promote the advance of the Ukrainian language and culture, which came to be known as "Ukrainization" at the time, as a kind of ploy and "deviation" from the policy of "giving preference" to Russian culture. Speaking of Ukrainization, B. Dmytryshyn heaped up a lot of his own allegations about

the Communist Party's national policy in the Ukraine. He referred to "a grave crisis of Bolshevism" and "the total bankruptcy of the Bolshevik national theories"[73]. J. Borys declares that the activities undertaken to promote Ukrainian culture were a concession to the "opposition" inside the Communist Party[74]. While putting forward such "conclusions," these authors obscure the historical fact that Ukrainization was just one of the forms of the actual implementation of the Party's national policy in the Ukraine. It was based on Lenin's works as well as on the Party's documents on the national relations issue.

While concentrating attention on Ukrainization, Sovietologists have been seeking to present it as a development contrary to Marxism-Leninism. Of course, they do not quote any major documents to bear themselves out. Yet, it is an examination of such documents in their totality that alone can permit the proper interpretation of Ukrainization which involved measures to ensure the free development not only of Ukrainian culture, but that of other ethnic cultures in the Ukraine as well. Even in one of the latest publications — *Language, Literacy, and Book Publishing in the Ukrainian S.S.R., 1923-1928*, demonstrating a certain departure from some of the most controversial Western interpretations, its author J. Liver, while admitting the great success the republic had gained in its cultural development, still failed to break out of the vicious circle of limited bourgeois mentality. He found the way of Ukrainian cultural development as unavoidably involving a clash with Russian culture[75]. But the hard facts disprove what certain quarters are trying to prove. Suffice it to recall that the Communist Party stressed the need to go on studying the Russian language and culture as an effective instrument of inter-community contact, that of promoting the Ukrainian people's closer friendship with other Soviet peoples, and bringing more of the treasures of Russian and world culture within the Ukrainian working people's reach. For instance, the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party on October 16 and 17, 1922, noted in its resolution the "full absolute equality of the Ukrainian and Russian languages, resolute struggle against all artificial Ukrainization and Russification along with the removal of the obstacles that would hinder the natural development of Ukrainian culture or bar the Ukrainian peasantry from access to Russian culture"[76].

In an attempt to "substantiate" the groundless argument that Ukrainization was a concession to powerful elements

hostile to Soviet government, some Sovietologists have been trying to cash in on comparing it with cultural development in the preceding period. B. Dmytryshyn described the Ukrainian Council of People's Commissars' Decree of August 1923 about Ukrainization as an "absurdity" on the grounds that the nationalization of public, political, economic and cultural activities had been proclaimed earlier on in the Constitution enacted in March 1919[77]. Such tricks are used to misconstrue the cause-and-effect relation of events. These Sovietologists "forget" that in 1919 the territory of the Republic was the battleground in the Civil War and that working people were fighting hard to uphold their right to live without exploitation and oppression. It goes without saying that in those circumstances the bulk of the forces and resources was used for military ends. Yet, right from the opening stages in the establishment of the Soviet system of government, the Party undertook certain steps towards promoting cultural development as well. A Ukrainian Academy of Sciences was instituted, while the Civil War was still going on, and a whole series of Ukrainian theatres and other cultural centres sprang up. With the peace-time construction effort started, the Republic could, naturally, allocate far more of its finances for cultural development.

That is just the aspect that Sovietology fights shy of dealing with, trying instead to make it appear that national culture needs nothing but decrees and orders to progress. They leave altogether out of account the simple fact that in the years of the Civil War, the Ukraine had too scarce a supply of material resources to ensure its proper cultural development. It is opportune to note at this point yet another distinguishing feature of the cultural development of that period, one which foreign "experts" pass over. I mean the fraternal aid from the Russian Federation. For instance, in the trying times of economic disarray and famine, in October 1921, the National Labour and Defence Council allocated 500,000 gold roubles for textbooks in Ukrainian to be printed abroad[78].

The measures the Party undertook in the field of cultural development turned out to be productive as early as the first half of the '20s. A full-scale drive to wipe out illiteracy got under way in the Republic. As of December 1st, 1925, it had upwards of 13,000 schools and ABC classes attended by a total of around 540,000 people, including over 200,000 women. There were about a thousand schools for under-educated in 1924. Altogether several million people were taught to read and write during those early recovery years alone,

A large amount of work was carried out to train teaching staffs, some out of workers and peasants, set up more schools, cultural and educational institutions, and put out more books and periodicals. Remarkable success was achieved in the field of specialized secondary and higher education. There were 43 colleges, 145 technical schools, and 30 factory-based schools of general education late in 1925. Science, litetature and art were advancing[79]. All those activities were aimed at redressing the actual cultural imbalance the Ukraine had inherited from the exploiter regime. Ukrainization was just one more form of cultural development that was largely instrumental in promoting that effort.

The Party never regarded any particular form of cultural development as something immutable or unchangeable. It was the actual pattern of priorities that dictated the choice of form. Yet that is one point that the exponents of Sovietology have never managed to grasp. They have been interpreting the subsequent change of form in the area of cultural development after the Ukrainization drive had, by and large, fulfilled the function it was intended to fulfil, as a modification of the very essence of the Communist Party's national relations policy. In line with this kind of reasoning, they argue that the Bolsheviks first showed themselves to be partisans of a Ukrainization programme, but subsequently revised the Party's entire national relations policy and heralded "the end of the period of relative cultural tolerance"[80]. Trans-Atlantic interpreters claim that the purpose of that "revision" was "to bring complete uniformity into every aspect of the Soviet system"[81]. Naturally, they produce no facts to bear out such "conclusions" for the simple reason that none exist.

Contrary to the hypocritical statements of Western pseudo-experts, Ukrainian culture was becoming richer ideologically and artistically at every stage of its continuous development due to the Communist Party's unfailing concern.

In an effort to discover any arguments at all to support their far-fetched theory of "uniformity," a number of Sovietologists have been referring to the struggle the Party and public opinion in this country waged against the hostile class forces attempting to use the cultural field for preaching the ideology of restoring capitalism. This struggle is interpreted as an "attack" on Ukrainian intellectuals (as in works by L. Tillet and F. Barghoorn)[82].

Of a piece with this kind of wishful thinking are the theories of "Ukrainian revival'" in Western publications. This high-sounding has been used, for example, by the

compilers of the *Handbook of Major Soviet Nationalities*, published in the U.S. In its article on the Ukraine, the '20s are described "as a golden age of Ukrainian literature, theatre and painting"[83]. *The New Encyclopaedia Britanica* found its entry on the Ukraine would have been incomplete without mentioning "the real flowering of the Ukrainian theatre" of those years[84]. However, all of these confessions are nothing short of a smokescreen for other, anything but grandiloquent declarations of Sovietologists. Once they get down to deciphering their own interpretations, it turns out that what they mean by the "flowering" and "golden age" is not the Ukrainian Socialist culture that was emerging in those years and that did produce works which really became classics. Foreign interpreters mean the formalistic and other anti-artistic manifestations and ideological mishaps in the writings of isolated intellectuals who were not yet altogether immune to the influence of the ideology of the exploiter classes.

It is not surprising that Sovietologists should have been trying to attribute the Ukrainization drive also to leadership "by non-Communist intellectuals"[85]. Accordingly, they seek to link that all up with an "inflow" of repatriated former members of middle-class parties. The accent is laid on the activities of those of them who counted on the Soviet system of State power degenerating under the New Economic Policy (NEP). A number of such individuals went on indulging in hostile propaganda, just as they did while in exile, trying to gain their own profit from Ukrainization. And yet bourgeois historiography is attributing some credit in promoting the Ukraine's cultural and scientific development to such personalities as M. Hrushevsky[86].

These interpretations can well be seen as biassed if viewed against the background of the contribution that many workers in science in the Ukraine, like P. Tutkovsky, a geologist, V. Lipsky, M. Kashchenko and A. Fomin, botanical scientists, L. Pisarzhevsky, a chemical scientist, M. Gamaleya, a medical scientist, V. Vernadsky, the first president of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, to mention just a few, made in those years. Falsifying the state of social sciences in the Ukraine has been a particularly malicious thing. Volumes produced by bourgeois authors on the subject abroad circumscribe all Ukrainian social sciences to the activities of M. Hrushevsky. For example, L. Tillet, while distorting the actual position of science in the Ukraine[87], says nothing about the scientists who strove to master the genuinely scientific methodology and carried on intensive research

on history, economics, literature, etc. One of them was A. E. Krymsky who did much to promote research in social sciences within the system of the Academy or other research institutions. As an invariable secretary of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, he was in charge of the historical and philological departments giving a lot of attention to promoting research on history, literature, and linguistics. In those years, A. Krymsky shared in the deliberations of various institutes and commissions which studied various problems of the language, literature, folklore, art, theatre, cinematography and geography of the Ukraine[88].

The history of the immediate pre-war years shows that the building of Socialism in the Ukraine in unity and co-operation with the sister Republics of the rest of the Union opened up a practical way towards meeting the people's national aspirations. The Socialist system which came to be established in the Ukraine created the conditions for the reunification of all Ukrainian lands.

That was so palpable evidence of social progress in the Ukraine that Sovietology could not avoid considering it. However, the purpose that it has set itself has been to lessen the impression these historic events produced. Above all, Sovietologists have been attempting to play down the meaning of reunification in their publications, to pass over and distort the factors that made it possible for the Ukrainian people's centuries-old dream to come true.

In treating the history of the Western Ukrainian lands, the adepts of Sovietology, while recognizing the facts of their colonial status within bourgeois-landlord Poland, have never given anything like an unbiassed assessment of that fact of history. They have been focussing on the outspoken extolling of the activities of the Ukrainian bourgeoisie in the period concerned and filling its publications with references to the industrial and commercial establishments and banks that once belonged to its representatives. Sovietologists have been at pains to identify the condition of the exploiting top crust with the life of millions of West Ukrainian working people, which they say "was better than ever". In reality, in consequence of the colonial policy of the authorities, the social and economic condition of the working people in those regions was distinguished by the worsening and progressively intensified ethnic oppression and political disfranchisement. Suffice it to note that the workers' wages did not meet even the official cost of living in 1928, that is, the time in the period under review, but reached only 90 per cent of the 1913 level, while dropping even further

during the Great Depression. The Ukrainian peasants were in a hopeless state of abject poverty[89].

The "works" put out by Western publishers are designed to veil the exploitation and the denial of human rights to working masses of the Western Ukraine so as to divert attention from that important factor which was breeding revolution. Bourgeois narrow-mindedness does not allow Sovietologists to tell the truth about the decisive role of progressive forces and their vanguard — the Communist Party of the Western Ukraine — in the struggle against the colonial occupation regime. The portrayal of the struggle of the masses is replaced, above all, by a description of terrorist acts of Ukrainian quislings against individual representatives of the Polish administration. That is to say that what Sovietological publications present as "revolutionary" action is, as a matter of fact, everything that was of a provocative character.

Engrossed as they are in their eulogies of the West Ukrainian bourgeoisie, foreign historiographers "forget" about a development of what was indeed of historic importance — the sweeping movement of the working people for their reunification within a single Socialist State[90].

The advocacy of the hirelings of imperialist reaction is particularly manifest in writings about the short-lived puppet "Carpathian Ukraine" regime (late 1938-early 1939) which was made and broken by Hitler's regime. Nevertheless, American and other Sovietologists describe the operation of that satellite entity at Choost and its masters in Berlin as "union." To cast aspersions on the Soviet Ukraine, which had become the centre of attraction for the population of all the Ukrainian lands, they strive, for example, to withhold the truth about the political terrorism practised by Carpathian führers after the Nazi pattern, and do not stop short of calling that gathering of Nazi survivors "a centre where Ukrainian life could develop freely"[91].

Some Western publications have produced a certain pattern of "coverage" of the reunification of the West Ukrainian lands with the rest of the Ukraine, a dream of long standing that the people of those lands finally saw come true. The approach behind this kind of "coverage" implies denying the very idea of reunification as the way to the social and national liberation of the Western Ukrainian working people. Some "Ukrainologists" can find nothing beyond their references to "occupation" and "change of master" as arguments to explain the Red Army's liberation march to help

the Ukrainian and Byelorussian brothers left at the mercy of fate by the rulers of bourgeois-landlord Poland.

Yet this contention is not shared by many historians in the West, which is due, in large measure, to the influence of the extensive coverage of the events as they were, in historical documents and writings by Soviet authors. This influence is to be seen in the conclusions one can come across in bourgeois publications to the effect that "the majority of the peasants were sympathetically disposed to the Soviets" in the Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia in 1939 [92].

That is to say that Sovietology has nothing beyond false concepts and interpretations to offer as an account of the important aspects of the development of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic in the period of building Socialism. Within discovering any new subjects, Western "studies" essentially deal with problems and questions which have already been dealt with or are under study by Soviet science. The appearance of Sovietological treatises on the history of the Ukraine has a purely ideological function to charge — counterbalance to a scientific Marxist analysis of the experience of building a Socialist society.

Politicized Western historiography and, above all, its American centres seek to question the historical record of building the foundations of Socialism in the Ukraine, playing up its own interpretation in an effort to dissuade from a Socialist option the people of the developing nations striving to get rid as soon as possible of their onerous legacy which they inherited from the imperialist powers in the economic and cultural fields.

3. THE BOGEY OF "DENATIONALIZATION" BEHIND A SCIENTIFIC SIGNBOARD

In their bid to discredit the Soviet socialist record, imperialist strategists count on presenting the new social and economic order destined to replace capitalism as antipodal to everything national. To this end, they are grossly distorting the history of the cultural revolution in the Ukraine not only at the time when the foundation stone of Socialism was laid, but throughout the subsequent stages of its development.

The basic idea of all allegations on these subjects and the starting point in doctoring the facts of history and modern times in politicized "Ukrainology" is the concept of "Russification" designed to infect the minds of the masses with a false concept of Socialist society as intolerant of the ethnic life of any community but the Russian. Sovietolo-

gists use this kind of pattern to build their writings which misrepresent the cultural relationship between the Ukrainian and Russian people and their languages.

The method of "investigation" of the problems involved has its roots reaching back into the idealistic "theory" of the "eternal struggle of nations" borrowed from bourgeois historiography which functioned in the Western Ukraine before the war and from the Orientalist centres of the Fascist Reich.

While appealing to "eternal" categories, bourgeois science has always attempted to escape a social-class analysis that enables the only right presentation of reality. By substituting the concept of "Russification" for the specific historical study of facts, Western "Ukrainologists" try to lead their readers astray from their right bearings on the issue of interrelationship of cultures and languages, and reduce its whole sum and substance to national friction. The mystifying effect is sought by passing over the true source that can generate ethnic conflicts — exploiter classes and groups. But, as everyone will remember, such classes and groups have long since been abolished in the U.S.S.R. in the course of the opening period of Socialist development. That created the unbreakable foundation for the exercise of full and equal rights enjoyed by the national cultures and languages of the Soviet Union, their flowering and their inter-enrichment. It is the well-conceived and scientifically-grounded national relations policy of the Communist Party that is one of paramount importance in this respect. It is based on the principles enunciated by Lenin: full equality of all nations and ethnic communities, their free development within a fraternal alliance, and a consistent pursuit of their convergence.

While ignoring the natural laws in operation behind social development Western interpreters allege that the only way to put the matter is either Ukrainian or Russian culture, either the Ukrainian or the Russian language. Putting the matter this way is typical of writings presenting the Ukrainian people's culture and language at the present stage as being "infringed", "harassed" or "persecuted". For example, the *Handbook of Major Soviet Nationalities*, published by the Centre for International Studies of the Massachussetts Institute of Technology maintains that the Ukrainian language has been reduced "to the position of dialect" [93].

In search of "proof", the makers of such "discoveries" have been juggling with facts. Hence their allegations of the "forcible and violent measures" by the State and the

Party and "forcible Russification." Accordingly, the emphasis in such "historical research" has been on distorting such aspects of ethnic cultural development in the Ukraine as the development of the education system, book publishing and periodicals, Ukrainian letters and arts.

Falsifiers have been particularly furious in their effort to challenge the fact that the choice of the language of tuition in Soviet schools is based on the voluntary principle. The freedom to choose the language of instruction does not in any way mean any detracting from the role and significance of the Ukrainian language. Nevertheless, the "students" of the Republic's education system, while collecting hand-picked facts, have been insisting on a "conspiracy against the Ukrainian language"[94].

One of the modern-day "debunkers of the truth", W. Veryha produced an article in 1983 where he maintained that the number of children attending Ukrainian schools dropped from 79 per cent in 1927 to 21 per cent in 1958, and further down by now[95]. Alas, the author's figure-juggling differs little from trades-people's principle "selling means cheating." Yet the facts selected by statistics as a result of the censuses which have been held do not bear out what Veryha and the *New York Magazine* he appeared in want the reader to believe. Ukrainian is the language of tuition at 82 per cent of the schools of general education in the Ukrainian Republic as a whole, and 91 per cent in its Western regions[96].

In recent times, Sovietology has brought forth some "specialists" on the history and present-day state of book publishing and periodicals in the Ukraine. To cast aspersion on this aspect of ethnic cultural development, they have been busy dissecting the tables of statistics referring to the number, types and circulation of newspapers and magazines, trying to prove there is an "offensive" by the Russian language against the Ukrainian. Such "studies" have been undertaken, in particular, by Harvard University. Yet the very statistics the University is trying to juggle with point to the general trend for Ukrainian-language periodical publications to increase in the Ukraine. For instance, the one-time newspaper circulation went up from 10 million in 1965 to 16 million in 1981, and that of magazine from 77 million to 99 million respectively. Now, a certain fluctuation of magazine circulation in some years, due to the amount of newsprint in stock, changing demand and other factors, equally affected the publications in the Ukrainian and in the Russian and other languages appearing in the Ukraine[97]. The development of the Republican press has, therefore, been

disproving the allegations of certain "privileges" of the Russian language over the Ukrainian.

It is indicative that in "covering" the various aspects of the Soviet Ukraine's cultural development, Sovietologists invariably concentrate their attention on the language factor, misinterpreting the actual developments arising from the fact that the role of the Russian language as the medium of inter-community communication and co-operation has been rising in the life of the Ukrainian, as well as of other peoples of the U.S.S.R. To discredit the Communist Party's ethnic relations policy, they do not disdain from misinterpreting the information regarding the voluntary principle as basic to the choice of the language of inter-community communication in the Ukraine. They find it to be a negative feature, for example, that the working people of the Western regions of the Ukraine who, of course, started on their way to fundamental social and economic change at a later stage, have been showing growing interest in the Russian language and its literature ever since the first years of reunification. Sovietology has been interpreting what has proved to be an essential vital need and requirement for the whole mass of the local population to gain access to the achievements of national and world science and culture as an offensive by the Russian language against the Ukrainian [98].

However, the growing importance of this language does not mean at all, as the "experts" across the Atlantic have been trying to make it out, that there is anything like "dislocation" of the Ukrainian and other "non-Russian languages". Statistical surveys have shown that the widespread use of the language of intercommunity communication in the U.S.S.R. combines well with the dependable preservation and knowledge of one's mother tongue as native. The history of this country's development ever since the October revolution of 1917 has provided incontrovertible evidence to show that the voluntary study and use of the Russian language contribute to a further development of the language of all the Socialist nations. That is clearly exemplified by the Ukrainian language which was hounded by the Czarist government and obtained an opportunity of free development only after the Socialist revolution. "It is precisely in Soviet times," Academician I. K. Byeloded, an authority on Ukrainian linguistics, has pointed out, "that the Ukrainian language has developed in all of its functional and expressive styles, and has become an asset — both in its written and oral form — of the great mass of working peo-

ple, the language of official government, the language of science, education and culture.... In terms of the development of its standards and the structural components, the Ukrainian language has advanced to the position of the world's most advanced languages, reflecting as it does the modern state of civilization and having improved the means to denote the accomplishments of mankind's social, scientific, and technological progress. In its progressive evolution, it has been drawing heavily on the wealth and resource of the Russian language with which it has all along maintained invariable creative contacts due to the community of their origin and entire historical development" [99].

One fact to attest to the genuine flowering of the Ukrainian language is, notably, the diverse and inexhaustible flood of literature on it, the publication of various, including multi-volume, dictionaries, particularly in the last few decades. One cannot fail to mention in this context so important an event in the cultural life of the republic as the edition of an 11-volume *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language* (1970-1980).

As to the transformation of the Russian language into a medium of inter-communication, which Sovietologists have been taking up their cudgels against, that has been due to natural reasons essentially explained by V. I. Lenin. In his article *Liberals and Democrats on the Language Question* he wrote that the "requirements of economic exchange will always compel the nationalities living within one State (as long as they want to live together) to study the language of the majority" [100]. Thanks to the Russian language, which is a potent instrument of interconnection and consolidation of the Soviet peoples, and a means whereby to gain access to the best of achievement in national and world culture, the Ukrainians, just as other peoples of the U.S.S.R. have an opportunity to move faster along the pathway of progress. The noble mission of the Russian language as the language of inter-community communication and co-operation in no way detracts from the significance of the Ukrainian language and its functional role. There are the census data to attest to that. For instance, during the last census of 1980, it was named as the native language by 89.1 per cent of the Ukrainians (32.4 million people). At the same time, this language was named as native by 140,300 Russians, 170,700 Poles, 35,900 Byelorussians, 16,600 Moldavians, 12,400 Jews, etc [101].

The facts prove that the problem of a battle of languages in the Ukraine, concocted by Sovietology, is false from start

to finish. In preaching the isolation of the Ukrainian language and culture, Western interpreters end up by opposing their continued development and flourishing and, at the same time, the accelerated social and economic advance of the Ukrainian republic. This can be seen, in particular, from pronouncements by Sovietologists concerning the publication of scientific and technical literature in Russian in the Ukraine and exchange of specialist manpower with the sister Republics. What they call "negative" for the distinctive ethnic development of the Ukrainian people is, in reality, part and parcel of scientific and technological progress and a stimulating factor of the economic and intellectual development of this country as a whole and of its individual republics, including the Ukraine.

In their attempt to misrepresent the sum and substance of ethnic cultural development in the Ukraine at the present time, falsifiers resort to their tried-and-tested method of backing up their anti-Soviet constructions with "historical rationales." They link up their arguments about "Russification" and "denationalization" with things that happened in national relations under Czarism. Publications, for instance, of Harvard University have been playing up the Acts of the autocracy aimed at restricting and banning the languages and cultures of the "aliens" [102]. Naturally, there are no Soviet documents of that kind, nor can there be any because the social and economic structures of the U.S.S.R. and Czarist Russia are poles apart. Nevertheless, there are recurrent allusions to the 1876 Decree which forbade the publication of literature in Ukrainian and to other similar Acts of the autocracy as "arguments" in support of their claims about "Russification". This connection is "explained" by theorizing in terms of bourgeois tale-telling about the "continuation" of the policy of the Czarist government by the Soviet State.

It is the false concepts of "denationalization" and "Russification" that underlie the "studies" made in the West on the subject of the history and contemporary development of the Soviet Ukrainian letters and arts. The theories of Sovietology and concomittant imperialist propaganda turn on the allegations of "restrictions" imposed on Ukrainian literature because of the application of the method of socialist realism to the creative work of writers and artists [103]. Naturally, Western pseudo-experts omit to mention that this is the very method that has served to produce masterpieces of art in the Ukraine which have come to form part and parcel of the storehouse of world literature. So while pretending to defend specific ethnic quality, Sovietology is

attacking the ideological and theoretical foundations behind the progress of Ukrainian Soviet literature.

As to the "coverage" of the situation in Ukrainian art, this, too, is treated as a target of a certain policy of "liquidation" of the ethnic features and traditions of the Ukrainian people. Being unable to deny the existence of Ukrainian culture in the Ukraine, overseas "experts" have invented versions about its "ethnographism" and "provincial level". These versions have been widely used, for instance, to describe the Ukrainian theatres so as to belittle their role and in that way denigrate the activities conducive to the continued advance of theatrical and other arts in the Republic. While lamenting the "sorry plight" of Soviet Ukrainian art, bourgeois authors cannot explain, however, why the Ukrainian songs, Ukrainian poetry, and Ukrainian dancing which, as they claim, have not risen above a provincial level, have risen to widespread fame throughout the Soviet Union or why the annual guest tours by Ukrainian performing groups of major world cultural centres, such as Paris, Rome, Berlin, New York, or Tokyo, are so triumphant. Foreign public reactions to the performances by Ukrainian theatrical companies in various countries of the Americas, Western Europe and Asia are a straight answer to those Sovietological insinuations. Typical of many of these reactions has been a comment by *La Prensa*, Argentinian newspaper, on August 1st, 1981, after a concert given by a group of opera singers and ballet dancers from the T. G. Shevchenko State Academic Opera House of the Ukraine. It wondered not without some bitterness: "Will we ever see Argentinian national performance reach anything like this level?"

Pseudo-studies of the relationship of the languages and cultures of the Russian and the Ukrainian peoples have been used for an ideological motivation of the particular aspects of the policy of confrontation and the anti-Communist "human rights campaign". This stereotype is widely used in the ideological subversion of imperialism aimed both against the peoples of the Socialist and developing nations and domestic audiences. The main purpose behind that kind of tactics is to divert public attention from the discrimination against the ethnic, including Ukrainian groups, in capitalist countries and from great power policy with regard to ethnic minorities which takes on the form of compulsory "Americanization" etc.

Now as to the Ukrainian language in capitalist countries, where there are some ethnic groups that use their native languages, it is, in fact, on its way to extinction. There are

no federal schools in the U.S., for example, with tuition in this language, although that country numbers over one and a half million people of Ukrainian extraction and there are communities of scores of thousands of ethnic Ukrainians in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit and other cities. Discriminatory practices tend to dislodge the languages of ethnic minorities. One can get an idea of the process of the loss of the native language, with factors of compulsory and natural assimilation intertwining, from some censal statistics of Canada. In 1931, the Ukrainian was the native language for 93.1 per cent of Canadian Ukrainians, in 1951 it was the one for 79.6 per cent, in 1961, that of 64.4 per cent and in 1971, that of 48.8 per cent [104].

Viewed against this background, the pseudo-scientific arguments of Sovietologists about "Russification" are seen to be playing the role of a kind of cover and excuse for racial outrages in the U.S. and ethnic discrimination in other capitalist countries and, in the long run, serve the forces seeking to undermine the working people's will to fight for their rights.

The "theses" by an American "Ukrainologist" V. Holubnychy published in 1977 (the editorial footnote in the periodical that carried that text said they "have been written not for publication") contained, for instance, a significant admission of that author who had earlier produced quite a few fake stories about the Ukraine's cultural record. He said that to a certain extent "the subject of the Russification of the Ukraine has been prompted to us by the so-called Western science". The author noted that "we are writing for it (bourgeois Sovietology — Ed.), for the Western reader..." [105].

Ever since the opening years of the Cold War, a number of Western historians took up that far-fetched problem which became part of the imperialist propaganda stock-in-trade right away. Such stories were then welcomed to its pages by the USIA's "theoretical" mouthpiece on the subject of anti-Communism — the *Problems of Communism* magazine [106].

In recent years, these efforts have been increasingly linked up with deliberate distortions of the essence of a new historical community of people — the Soviet nation. A number of writers, such as K. Farmer, have been trying to picture the formation and consolidation of this new, higher type of a social community in the Soviet Union as evidence of a policy directed towards denationalizing the Ukrainians and other peoples of the U.S.S.R.[107]

There is one source behind all inferences of that kind —

an anti-scientific treatment of the Soviet people as a kind of a "new nation" created on the basis of the Russian language and culture [108]. Western "experts," engaged in the investigation of the history of the Ukraine of the '70s and '80s, have been wasting their time and effort trying to back up that absurd version by slanting statistics about periodicals published in the Soviet Ukraine, national censal and other material relating to the development of the language and culture of the Ukrainian people. It is indicative that while clamouring about the "loss of Ukrainian distinctive national identity", Sovietologists have been passing over the fundamental Communist Party documents which prove that the Party has never aimed, nor does it aim to carry through anything like a forcible assimilation of peoples and that, on the contrary, guiding itself as it does by V. I. Lenin's precepts, it has opposed any attempt at ignoring the existing ethnic distinctions within the integral Soviet people. One of the latest examples to prove that is the updated programme of the CPSU which underlines that "in its activities, the CPSU makes every provision for the multi-ethnic character of Soviet society" [109].

So discussing the issues relating to the development of ethnic national languages and cultures in socialist society at the present stage is a trend in Sovietological writings that is integral to the imperialist policy of scaring the masses with the bogey of denationalization. While misrepresenting the character of ethnic cultural development in the Ukraine, the authors of these works, whether they wish it or not, serve the narrowly egotistic interests of the ruling minority of imperialist States and its demand for the defence of the immutability of the principles of exploitation and racial oppression of working masses.

4. THE DOCTRINE OF COUNTER-INSURGENCY IN ITS "HISTORICAL" RETROSPECT

Imperialist elements are at pains not only to vilify the Socialist system and the forces in battle to establish and consolidate it, but also to try and justify the struggle against this system to the extent of using armed force. "Ukrainian studies" are being used, along with all other means, as starting material on which to build aggressive propaganda. The starting point in twisting history is the concept of bankrupt counter-revolutionaries about the "Ukrainian people's resistance" to the new social and political system. While concentrating attention on the activities of the over-

thrown exploiter classes and their vestiges, Sovietologists have been trying to channel their "research" in a utilitarian militaristic direction.

The imperialist doctrine of local war has given yet another impulse to that kind of "research". It was launched along with a policy enunciated at the turn of the 60s with a view, among other things, to suppressing the national liberation struggle.

Without in any way ceasing to bank on a world war, the aggressive forces have turned, in particular, to a pursuit of new forms of armed struggle. That is what accounts for the fairly wide currency of such concepts as "limited", "insurgent", and "counter-insurgent" wars. The attention that imperialist circles began to pay to these questions was prompted by their plans for pseudo-guerilla and counter-guerilla action as a special instrument to fight patriotic forces in different countries. Sabotage, terrorist acts and similar tactics were considered to be the principal methods to use in such wars. To carry through such operations, the Pentagon launched an intensive effort to train the men for "the Special Forces", notably at the Army's Psychological Warfare School at Fort Bragg [110].

In devising the scheme for "limited wars", the military availed themselves of the services of exponents of social sciences [111]. Much attention has been given in the context of such "research" to devising new forms and methods of suppression of national liberation movements. It is direct from the Pentagon that American Universities have been getting appropriate subsidies, as witnessed by Professor M. Parenty, who had connections of long-standing with the quarters concerned with Sovietology [112].

Nor do the "Ukrainological" centres stay out of such contact between the military and the Sovietologists. These centres were at first busy working for the interests of U.S. imperialism in Latin America, where the Cuban revolution had just triumphed, and liberation struggles were mounting in other parts of the continent. What those "scholars" proposed in their writings boiled down to reviving Hitler's practice of eroding the patriotic resistance movement and using terrorism against the civilian population, as fascist troops did, in particular, in the Nazi-occupied territory of the Ukraine. That was a reference to the Nazi-armed quisling bands that came to be called a "Ukrainian Insurgent Army" (UIA).

In 1960, the U.S. Army's *Military Review* published an article extolling the banditry sponsored by the Organization

of Ukrainian Nationalists with a view to resuming pseudo-guerilla action "in the event of another war" [113]. Similar articles appeared in a number of other military publications at the same time.

In an attempt to curry favour with the suppressors of freedom, "Ukrainologists" set about fumbling through the ash-heap of history for specimens of the experience of the Fascist Reich. As a kind of handbook for Latin American death squads, there was a whitewashing book published in Spanish in Argentine about the "history" of the *Halychina* Division, an SS unit known for its part in punitive expeditions against the guerilla-held zones of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia during the Second World War. The author of that publication was one J. Tys-Krochmaliuk, one of the organizers of that unit, which consisted of collaborationists, who turned into a "military historian" after the war [114].

As an appeal to all those recipients — the military staffs of imperialism — there was a voluminous "study" by E. Codo *Insurgents Behind the Iron Curtain* which was entirely concerned with extolling the terrorist tactics of bands in the Western Ukrainian lands during the Second World War. The author explained that the purpose behind his appeal to the past was to get "Western military thought" to lay accent on the "growing significance" of war "behind the line". In this connection, he mentioned the "U.S. Special Forces" as units designed to conduct such action in modern conditions [115].

A further fillip to elaborating "historical" topics consonant with the policy of armed intervention in the internal affairs of nations was given by the policy of aggression launched against the Vietnamese and other peoples of South East Asia. When the U.S. Navy and Air Force perfidiously attacked the Democratic Republic of Vietnam in August 1964, and a storm of protest erupted throughout the world, and even in the U.S. proper, against the escalation of that aggression, the "Ukrainologists" in New York garnished their first "analysis" of past and present events with an unequivocal statement of their "full support for the President's action in Vietnam" [116]. That was followed up by a wide-scale publicity campaign to advertise the experience of the OUN bands, their tactics of terrorism and sabotage. The appearance of such writings was stimulated by forces that sought to use the U.S. Army as the hangman of the Vietnamese people. Stereotypes in such publications were utilized by various elements within the U.S. ruling establishment. Speaking up in the Congress for the war venture

against Vietnam a number of members of the House of Representatives cited the action of UIA bands as an "example of struggle against Communism". In 1967, Congressman E. Derwinski mentioned the Munich *Encyclopaedia of Ukrainology* as the source of that information [117]. M. Young and some other senators praised the sabotage acts of bands that went on the rampage in the Nazi-held Ukraine as a new kind of tactics [118].

The pseudo-scientific trumpeters of "limited war" have also been used against the anti-militarist public opinion pressure that was mounting at home. The Washington quarters tried to use them in particular, for "balancing" the ideas of aggression in academic circles. For instance, there was a debate on the U.S. war in Vietnam in Philadelphia in May 1965. Following critical remarks made by one of the professors present, an "opinion" was expressed by one I. Rudnytsky who repeated the propaganda arguments of Pentagon hawks, couched in terms of geopolitics, about the "outstanding importance of Vietnam space." Taking up the cudgels to defend the fire-brands of "local war" that "Ukrainologist" charged American scientists opposed to the "dirty war" with guiding themselves by "moral", rather than "strategic" and "political", arguments in its assessment. That was a way to justify the criminal methods of warfare used against the Vietnamese people.

The extra efforts of the "experts" were directed towards brainwashing young Americans of Ukrainian extraction. It was the newspapers and magazines of anti-Communist organizations that were the first to be used for that dirty work. In their articles, they invariably appealed to the "history" as dished up by falsifiers, trying to present the hirelings of Hitler's Reich as "fighters" for the "liberation" of the Ukraine and to lure young people into camps for the practical training of "volunteers" that were to be dispatched to Vietnam to fight for the profits of monopoly capital. Once in those camps, these young men found themselves under control of "tutors" and "guardians" — former SS-men and members of bands, and former quisling policemen [119]. Racist ideas and tactics of spying and sabotage work were taught by those instructors as if for the study of the history of the Ukraine.

The brainwashing of "volunteers" went on, in agreement with Pentagon generals, in South Vietnam, too, where anti-Soviet material about the Ukraine was circulated and used as background to broadcasts taped in the U.S. At the same time, there were attempts in the U.S. proper to publicize

the action of individual "volunteers" dispatched into the jungle of Vietnam as "heroic". However, those efforts, designed to mesmerize young people, did not produce the results expected. American young people were turning into one of the most active forces of the anti-war opposition. Americans of Ukrainian origin were involved in that movement. Many of them adamantly refused to play the role of assassins and terrorists imposed on them by destroying their call-up cards.

There is yet another aspect of the use of college-trained Sovietologists that claims attention in implementing the concept of "local" wars. They worked directly as instructors to teach the methods of fighting Vietnamese patriots, notably, in Saigon, at a special seminar which was to work out and discuss recommendations for the suppression of the guerrilla movement in South Vietnam [120].

The deeper the American military bogged down in the quagmire of "limited war", the more feverish was the search of "new" means to "win out". Trans-Atlantic propaganda publications accordingly played up the "examples" which, as their authors believed, could come handy in choosing the methods and tactics of subversive action against the patriotic struggle of the peoples. With the failure of the imperialist venture in Vietnam in sight, the U.S. produced yet another opus again praising the subversive and terrorist practice of the hirelings of Hitler's services during the Second World War on the territory of the Ukraine. The opening pages of that "study" mentioned the war in Vietnam and acknowledged the failure of the invasion "despite the overwhelming superiority of American armaments." While trading on an obvious fact — the failure of the aggressive plan of the U.S. Government, the author was in a hurry to offer his remedy. He called for concentrating attention on the practice of the anti-guerilla action of the Nazis (without, of course, saying that both the German Nazis and their modern-day followers saw for themselves how futile it was) and gave a detailed account of the sabotage methods and means, claiming that "the study should be on the agenda of world military and political leaders" [121].

There was no let-up in the "research" to whitewash subversive tactics after the venture of U.S. militarists in Vietnam fell through. The main reason behind it is the continued effort of imperialism to turn history back by suppressing the liberation movements of the peoples. Speaking on behalf of the American Association for the Study of the Nationalities (U.S.S.R. and East Europe), in Chicago in December,

1977, S. Horak plumped for the creation of a special centre to produce publications about the Reich "volunteer" units formed in the course of the Second World War.

While attaching great importance to the "investigation" of such action, Sovietologists are trying to obscure the truth about the origin of those bands and about their terrorist character. Typical in this respect has been the contention by Professor G. Strobel of the University of Mainz, borrowed from anti-Soviet "Ukrainology" that the UIA "fought against Germans and also against Russians" [122]. The function that the "two-front" struggle fraud discharged was to veil the connection of the OUN bands with the fascist German occupation authorities and with the operation of the secret services of the Third Reich. The unending attempts of Sovietology to picture those bandit actions as "anti-fascism" are aimed at whitewashing the OUN criminals who have found refuge in the West and entered the service of their new masters and also to justify Hitler's tactics of terrorism and sabotage, emulated by modern imperialism, complete with its methods of conducting pseudo-guerilla and counter-guerilla action, performed, in particular by the Ukrainian quislings — the worst enemies of freedom.

As the events of the Second World War recede into history, imperialist Sovietology is getting more cynical and persistent in trying to justify that banditry. No sooner had yet another piece of writing about the UIA appeared in the West than the *Slavic Review* magazine responded with a rehash of the shopworn versions of reactionary historiography about the "liberation struggle" and a "war on two fronts". Moreover, the reviewer, one B. Herasymiv blasphemously describing the Nazi-armed assassins and terrorists as "advocating the liberation and equality of nations", went as far as to attribute the ideology of "democratic socialism" (!) to them [123].

There was a book by yet another "Ukrainologist" dealing with the whole period of the 20s which prompted a further look at the standing practice of Sovietology to whitewash the hirelings of fascism. Because it referred to the action of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists, the reviewer, this time an "expert" on this theme, J. Armstrong, put the whole of his thrust into trying to prove the unprovable — the absence of a close connection between the quislings and fascists. For that reason, he praised the author of the book for his proper understanding of the "problem" of modern Sovietology and for his attention to "distinct ideological differences between

Ukrainian integral nationalism and fascism"[124]. Falsifiers have made yet another massive attempt in this sense under the auspices of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies. Within the framework of its convention in 1981, they organized a symposium "Ukrainians in World War II" during which such speakers as J. Armstrong, G. Kulchycky and K. Farmer were at pains to discover "evidence" to prove the UIA bands to have been a popular movement[125].

But try as they might to discover all kinds of "differences" and "divergences" between the enemies of the peoples, these would be specialists in Slavic studies are unable to produce any more or less valid arguments against the undeniable facts which show that the bands that called themselves "the Ukrainian Insurgent Army" were the instruments of the fascist secret services and the Wehrmacht. Created as they were early in 1943 at the behest of the Abwehr and SD they received arms, ammunition and directives from the Nazis. With the help of those quislings, the fascist strategists sought to resolve their problems of struggle against the "enemies of the Reich" — detachments of people's avengers whose numbers were rising all the time on occupied territory, and of conducting acts of wholesale terrorism against the civilian population and those of sabotage behind the advancing line of Soviet troops[126].

With imperialist military passing over to a wider practice of terrorism and "undeclared wars", the Sovietology of the 70s included a "study" of the kulak banditry of the 20s as its "topical" subject. For example, a dissertation on bandit action in the Ukraine in the early half of the 20s was accepted for consideration in 1970 at Georgetown University closely connected with the Pentagon quarters[127]. It was the anarchist bands under Nestor Machno that were chosen as a subject of particularly intensive "investigation" in America. A paper on "Machno and His Movement" was delivered at a seminar at the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University in 1970-1971[128]. That "investigation" was undertaken by such individuals as V. Peters, M. Palij, and M. Malet[129].

In hundreds of pages they wrote to sing the praise of terrorism, those authors never so much as mentioned those who constituted the social base of the armed banditry of the '20s — the kulaks. They found no better name than "peasant uprisings" to denote the acts of violence committed by the kulak bands. Accordingly, they attempted to make heroes of the bandit ringleaders, as one can well see in the efforts

made in present-day historiography across the Atlantic to eulogize Machno personally. One of the American "students" of the Machno movement, M. Palij, although compelled to speak of that ringleader as a "terrorist", still found it right and proper to combine that characterization with the false argument that the bandit ataman was "fighting the enemies of the people, defending their properties and freedom." Two pages later, the same author said that "Machno had no positive goal either as an Ukrainian or as an anarchist" [130]. In an effort to present the Machno movement as a force supposedly above the class warfare that was going on in the South Ukraine, J. Bradley of Manchester University, following M. Malet, assured his readers that "the Greens" (that is how he called the kulak armed squads — Ed.) had very little in common with the Whites" [131]. Sovietology has been looking for the slightest differences in the operations of the White Guard armies and kulak bands just to avoid touching on the main thing — their common line of furious struggle against the newborn government of the working people.

The theories designed to blur over the class roots of the Machno movement and things like that resolve themselves, in the long run, into whitewashing the tactics of terrorism. What claims attention in this context is the bid to pass over the atrocities that were committed against the civilian population by the bands under Machno, Petlyura and other counter-revolutionaries during the Civil War and, later on, during the recovery period to overcome the economic disarray. One cannot fail to mention that because, after all, the cruelty and sadism of the acts of violence they wreaked on human beings were typical distinguishing features of kulak banditry [132]. It was in that period that terrorist groups, now referred to as "insurgent" in Sovietological publications and dissertations, carried on Petlyura's practice with regard, notably, to the Jewish population, staging pogroms which even the foreign bourgeois press had to report at the time. For instance, the French *Temps* newspaper wrote in 1921 that they had "turned into veritable robbers" that were ransacking and burning down Ukrainian townships and villages inhabited by Jews.

Commissioned to whitewash terrorism, Sovietologists have, of course, been "forgetting" to say that the bandits interfered with peaceful work in the countryside and with the supply of bread to the cities and raw materials to industry, and pillaged railway trains. The Soviet authorities, we may recall, undertook vigorous action which made it possible to

smash up the biggest contingents of armed counter-revolutionaries by the end of 1921 [133]. Neither can Sovietology deny the fact of the rather quick stamping out of the seats of banditry. Yet its exponents put that down only to the action of the Red Army units. They did so because as falsifiers they treated the afore-said events not as a class struggle, but as a conflict of two nations — Ukrainian and Russian. Therefore, they called this country's armed forces "Russian" omitting to mention that the Red Army represented the interests of all the Soviet peoples and was ethnically plural. It had a large number of Ukrainian peasants and workers in it. One fact ignored by Sovietology to show how far from reality are the above-mentioned deliberations is that the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine called on Mikhail Frunze, who commanded the forces of the Ukraine and the Crimea, to form Ukrainian military units to fight the bandits, which comprised the famous Red Cossack corps under V. M. Primakov. Their participation facilitated the defeat of the bandit squads in Kiev region and other provinces of the republic in 1921.

And still the action of military units, whatever Sovietologists may claim, was not the sole but only one of the facts behind the elimination of kulak terrorism. In trying to bear out their own version, the authors of Western "studies" about the "insurgents" avoid speaking of so important an aspect as the activities of Communist units expressing the will of the Ukrainian working peasantry. What we see here quite clearly is a tendency to avoid presenting the facts of history which do not serve to support far-fetched concepts. However, without taking these facts into account, it is impossible to appreciate the real character of the struggle against banditry or the reasons why it was put to rout fairly quickly. Further evidence of the participation of the mass of peasants in the elimination of kulak terrorism was furnished by a peasant, P. Klymenko, who addressed the Seventh All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets on December 13, 1922. In Kiev region, he said, "the poor peasants have taken up arms and together with the Red Army men driven and destroyed all bandits without exception" [134]. That statement reflected a significant development. By decision of the Fifth Conference of the Communist Party of the Ukraine in November, 1920, rural Communists and YCLers were to be formed as special squadrons and young workers were to be enlisted to fight the bands, too. Rural self-defence detachments were formed in the Ukraine, as were special mission units with local inhabitants as their core. In mid-November,

the special units alone had a strength of 64,600 [135]. Speaking at the Second All-Ukrainian Congress of Communist delegates, Mikhail Frunze emphasized that the Peasant Committees played the main part in routing out the kulak banditry in the Ukraine. The Red Army's success in fighting the forces of armed counter-revolutionaries, he said, became possible because "it had millions of poor peasants behind it" [136].

An examination of the activities of emigrant counter-revolution and military and intelligence services of Western states in the period in question provide unchallengeable evidence to expose the false assertions that those bands represented the people. That is a point which is usually omitted in present-day bourgeois writings. However, in an attempt to present banditry as a factor of special significance in the developments of the 20s some Sovietologists have had to touch on that aspect too. So they unwittingly quoted some evidence to disprove their own stories about the "popular" character of the armed kulak actions.

For example, G. Kulchycky's doctoral dissertation "The Ukrainian Insurgent Movement from 1919 to 1926" contained some information about the support for bandit actions by foreign-based ringleaders of Ukrainian counter-revolution. He writes that Petlyura and his "General Staff" in Czenstochow began taking frantic action in 1921 "to strengthen and co-ordinate" bandit activities. It was decided "to create an Insurgent Staff under General Tyutyunnyk, which was to begin work immediately". The author admits that the authorities of bourgeois Poland "did not object" to those activities of S. Petlyura and his following, "promising to help him organize four military divisions" for an invasion of the Ukraine. While describing the structure of the "Insurgent Staff", which controlled the bands of Petlyura in the Ukraine, Kulchycky points out that there was a Polish army liaison officer in it and that there was a plan worked out to divide the Ukraine into five zones, each subdivided into districts. Each district "commander" was to be appointed by the foreign-based "Insurgent Staff" and to be in contact with it. Not even the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and bourgeois Poland prevented the Petlyura staff from carrying on its action to lead the bands. It operated, as the author of the dissertation points out, on the territory of Poland "unofficially." Besides, the official Polish authorities counted on using the "insurgents" also as "diversionary forces" [137].

Now, even this by no means full evidence shows the

kulak-bandit action to have largely been sponsored by the forces of counter-revolution swept out of this country and the official authorities of capitalist countries that supported them in their intervention in the affairs of the Ukrainian republic.

So, a view of banditry as a movement of the Ukrainian peasantry is a gross falsification of the historical events and a piece of slander against the entire mass of the Ukrainian people. The purpose of such tactics is to distort the history of a whole nation just for the sake of the interests of present-day imperialist reaction seeking to oppose the forces of social progress in every way, terrorism included. Sharing as they do in the advocacy and propaganda of the methods and tactics of terrorist activities, the "Ukrainologists", hired by monopoly capital, demonstrate what kind of really sinister plans they play for. Their "studies" placed at the service of international violence against the freedom movements of the peoples are a desecration of the historical science and its great humanistic ideals.

5. UNDER THE FALSE FLAG OF "NATIONAL COMMUNISM"

This is a sociological concept, also begotten in Sovietological centres, that has become fashionable with a number of historians in the West in the post-war years. "National Communism" is a theory contending that ethnic contradictions will become a factor eroding world socialism and thereby assisting the strategy of imperialism.

The search of new forms of propaganda tactics against socialism has unequivocally shown itself in the injection of "national Communist" versions into the bourgeois historiography of the Ukraine. This connection of political propaganda and "scientific research" revealed itself with ample evidence for the first time in the context of imperialism's abortive design to undertake a direct invasion of socialist countries and the collapse of its doctrines of "containment" and "liberation."

However, the "studies" dealing with "Ukrainian national Communism" began earlier still at centres which were devising long-term programmes for waging ideological warfare against Socialism. This mission was left to the American "programme of research on the U.S.S.R." created in the early '50s with subsidies from the Ford Foundation. It included the collection and slanted interpretation of materi-

al regarding nationalistic deviationism in the Communist Party of the Ukraine and in the petty bourgeois parties operating in the Ukraine in the '20s, and so on. Its first result was an annotated bibliography *Ukrainian Communism and Soviet Russian Policy Toward the Ukraine*, published in 1953, which referred to publications "directly or indirectly" related to "the question of Ukrainian national Communism", as J. Reshetar pointed out in the preface to it [138]. A further publication under the same "programme", which followed soon afterwards was a treatise of the bourgeois party of Borot'bists whose activities were characterized "as a chapter in the history of the Ukrainian Communism" [139].

It was, however, at the time when imperialism was plotting a counter-revolutionary rebellion in Hungary, in October 1956, that the concept of "national Communism" acquired an outspokenly political colouring. Once they found it futile to try and bring Socialist countries back into the capitalist fold by means of undisguised acts of aggression, the Cold War strategists began to talk about "national Communism". One of the main protagonists of the "liberation" doctrine John F. Dulles spoke up as early as 1956 for the slogan of "national Communism" to be used in the struggle against actual Socialism.

The speeches of Trans-Atlantic policy-makers have inspired some "scientific works" which extolled the manifestations of nationalistic deviationism which occurred in the '20s. A monograph by G. Luckyj falsifying the history of Ukrainian letters of the '20s and '30s, which appeared in 1956, was greeted in American Sovietology as one of the first treatises proclaiming the slogan of "national Communism," which imperialist ideologues had put into vogue, as a counter-balance to the "Moscow-type" Communism [140]. A reference to "Ukrainian National Communism" was also included at the same time in a book on "nationalism" by F. Barghoorn [141].

This "theme" has become an object of consistent "research" backed up by appropriate financial injections. A scholarship was awarded as early as 1957 by the Ford Foundation to M. Luther "for research in Columbia University on national Communism in the Soviet Ukraine, 1921-1932" [142]. One idea by which to judge the character of that research was provided by J. Reshetar who stated that the notion "Ukrainian national Communism" was equivalent to "bourgeois nationalism" and other similar "isms" and that its study "in the fields of literature, politics, and economics in the form of Khvylovyism, Shumskyism and Vo-

lobuevism [143]... are even today of more than academic or purely historical significance" [144].

The change-over to the subjects which, as imperialist ideologues conceive it, must fuel this kind of propaganda could be seen in "economic" publications which, under the pretence of "defending the national interests" of the peoples of Socialist countries, attacked the principles of proletarian internationalism. Typical in this respect have been historical excursions playing up the far-fetched idea of the Ukraine's autarchy, which cropped up in the '20s and even at that time was strongly opposed by the Ukrainian Bolsheviks. In this way, Sovietologists tried to project a reactionary concept on present-day realities, expressing the hope for the economic structure of the Republic to be reorganized in line with localist trends.

Foreign "experts" have likewise set about digging up details concerning nationalistic deviationism in cultural matters in the '20s and '30s. That is what accounted for the interest of ideological wreckers in certain writings by M. Khvylovy. A collection of his stories, translated into English, with a Foreword by G. Luckyj, was published in New York in 1960 [145]. Khvylovy, who participated in the revolutionary events, is known to have lost faith in the ideals of the revolution later on under petty-bourgeois influence, degrading as much as to preach the obscurantist "Away from Moscow" slogan. Back in the '20s, the Communists of the Ukraine exposed both the ideological invalidity of nationalistic deviationism and its incompatibility with the promotion of friendship of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples and the building of Socialism. However, it is just the escapades of nationalistic deviationists that falsifiers began to pass off for the "word of Communism". The speculative nature of the reference to such a character as Khvylovy was demonstrated by I. Rudnycky's review which laid accent on a "literary technique" which, as Sovietologists figured out, would conduce towards an alienation from Communism. "None goes as far as he who knows not wither he is going", the reviewer recalled [146].

To back up such plans, the Prologue Publishers of New York put out a collection of "Documents" in 1962 proclaiming the theory about a "national form of Communism" for each particular country. What it meant however, as one could see from the introductory article, was not taking into account the local specific conditions in creating a new type of society, but attempting to discard the fundamental

principle behind such a pursuit — proletarian internationalism.

The Communist Party of the Ukraine obviously did not qualify for the declared stereotype of "national Communism" which angered the publishers. It is the enforced recognition of the internationalist character of the Communist Party of the Ukraine that largely accounts for the Sovietologists' search of the carriers of the concept of "national Communism" among petty-bourgeois parties using pseudo-Communist phraseology. One can see that from the labels they put on the Ukrainian Communist Party (UCP). For instance, R. Sullivant, without any evidence in hand to support his argument, called the UCP "remarkable inasmuch as it was a Communist, albeit non-Bolshevik party" [147]. By this spurious formula, he and those of his ilk tried to mislead an uninformed reader. In the *Pages from the History of the Communist Party of the Ukraine*, published in the U.S., the UCPists are called a "party of Ukrainian Communism" and a "Marxist" party supposedly serving the interests of the Ukraine. It is indicative that all of these apologetic pronouncements were featured parallel with invectives against the Bolsheviks of the Ukraine as "an external force". This kind of approach to presenting the materiel in question betrays the intention of falsifiers to discover something in the UCP's activities as an alternative to the Communist Party.

However, the arguments used in their publications about the UCPists clearly hold no water. As one can see even from the facts they produce themselves, the "Marxism" of the UCPists had nothing in common with Marxist-Leninist science. The very origin of that party shows it to have been a petty-bourgeois one right from the start. It emerged in 1920 as an outgrowth of the breakaway groups of petty-bourgeois parties — the Ukrainian Social Democratic Workers' Party and the Ukrainian Party of Socialist Revolutionaries.

Trying to embellish the pseudo-Communist image of the UCPists, Sovietologists have not disdained even gross slanting. Sullivant, for instance, declares, contrary to facts, that the UCP "supported" the Bolshevik programme right from its very inception [148]. He avoids commenting on the fact that UCPist declarations couched in Marxist terms were of an ostentatious kind and were designed to gain the right of legal activity. It is due to their declarations that the Soviet Government authorized UCP activity. However, once they were free to act, the UCPists launched

provocative operations against the Soviet authorities in the Ukraine. Western bourgeois historiography has qualified that action as "opposition" to the Communist Party of the Ukraine (Bolsheviks) "chiefly in the national question" [149]. However, UCPist attacks were on all the basic questions involved in building Socialism in the Ukraine. For instance, the advocates of "national Communism" themselves admit, if in passing, that the UCPists opposed the New Economic Policy [150], which was an important instrument of extricating the Ukraine and other Republics from economic disarray. The UCP tried to cash in on its own allegation that the Russian Communist Party pursued a colonialist policy with regard to the Ukraine. Without giving themselves the trouble to look at the hard facts of history, Sovietologists have subscribed to it to support their claim about "national Communism".

At a time when the Ukraine found itself thrown years back economically by war and disarray, the UCPists put forward their treacherous proposal for breaking off the well-established economic relationship between the sister nations, which was the major asset to enable the Republic's fast industrial upsurge. That is to say the UCPist pronouncements ran counter to the basic interests of the Ukrainian working people. The UCPists and the masses were diametrically opposed. That was an indication of two lines — one of ostentatiously nationalist insulation and alienation, which was preached by the UCP, and the internationalist, which was consistently pursued by the Communist Party of the Ukraine and shared by the workers and by the mass of peasants.

Because of its demagogic and provocative acts, the UCP was slipping down the slope to self-isolation. It had 500 members in 1921 and 200 in 1924 [151]. A "real Communist" Party turned out to be just a sect which has, in fact, been admitted by Sovietology, too. R. Sullivant has pointed out that the UCP "was unable to attract a mass following and remained a small group of intellectual leaders" [152]. J. Borys said in his turn that "the UCP did not have sufficient membership to play a prominent role in or influence the political life of the Ukraine and the policy of the Communist Party of the Ukraine (Bolsheviks)" [153]. As far as the reasons behind so scant "popularity" go, those authors have been trying to discover them not in the actual platform of the UCPists and in their practical activities hostile to Ukrainian working people, but in "Bolshevik pressure". Sovietologists do not want to refer to the documents of those years which clearly expose the UCPists for what they were.

It is not beside the point to recall in this context the memorandum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine sent to the Executive Committee of the Communist International. It noted that the UCP, that "miserable group", "has not overcome its counter-revolutionary past". "The name of Communists, which the UCPists have arrogated, deceives the working masses of the Ukraine who find watered-down Petlyuralism dished up in the guise of Communism." The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine also pointed out that the UCP had become a centre of attraction of anti-Soviet elements engaged in hostile agitation and playing into the hands of external and internal counter-revolution [154]. Even the *Encyclopaedia of Ukrainology*, a handbook of ideological subversion, published back in the years of the Cold War, stated that the UCPists had acted hand in glove with all opponents of Socialism. It pointed out, for instance, that a UCP member, A. Yareshchenko had become the archbishop of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, that haven of Petlyura people and other enemies of Soviet government. That was, indeed, some "evidence" in favour of the UCP "Communism" that Sovietologists were at pains to advertize!

Some authors, in a bid to discover "arguments" to prove the UCP's "Communist" character, have been trading on its "connections" with the Communist International. Yet those "connections" boiled down to two demagogic appeals of the UCPists to the Executive Committee of the Communist International demanding to be recognized as undivided spokesmen for the revolutionary forces in the Ukraine. Western publications pass over that point, as a rule. Accordingly, they omit to say why the Executive Committee of the Communist International decided on the dissolution of the UCP. Sovietologists interpreted that episode as a message to UCP representatives to "disband" their Party [155]. And not a word about the fact that this "decision" had been necessitated by a second provocative UCP appeal to the Communist International. A commission set up by the Comintern Executive Committee made up of O. Kuusinen, Sen Katayama, I. Pyatnitsky, K. Zetkin, and others, exposed the UCP totally and completely, pointing out that this organization had "objectively" worked towards a national division of the forces of the proletarian dictatorship in the Ukraine. The dissolution of the UCP was the logical finale of its anti-people activities.

In the meantime, foreign centres have been working out "stories" designed to stir up localist trends behind the signboard of national interests. A "Committee on Research on the After-Revolutionary Ukraine and the Soviet Union" heard a report at its meeting in New York in October 1962, which considered the ways of converting "localist deviations" into "political opposition" and a means to stimulate the "centrifugal aspirations of the non-Russian peoples". That act of "intellectual subversion" was of a piece with the objectives of the subsequent anti-Soviet struggle "in open political forms". The man who presented the report maintained that for localism to acquire a political complexion was a comparatively long process and that "in all probability, it would follow the line of 'national Communism' ".

It should be noted that Sovietologists by no means consider the concept of "national Communism" to be their own persuasion. Even the most zealous proponents of "national Communism" stress that point in statements intended for their "home" audiences in the West. That is a distinguishing feature of "Ukrainological" propaganda as a phenomenon representing the operation of the centres of politicized Sovietology.

On the whole, the "research" concerning "national Communism" was an attempt to stimulate anti-Marxist, revisionist pronouncements. This general line has been masterminded by such ideologues as Z. Brzezinski and H. Skilling. All the actions of Western countries, Skilling wrote, must be appraised, considering whether or not they contribute to the "emergence of trends toward national Communism." He emphasized that Western politicians "hope for its weakening through some form of national Communism" [156].

This concept conformed to the objectives of imperialism and became integral to the "bridge-building" doctrine. It went together with a massive propaganda drive playing up the slogans of "national Communism." It was Czechoslovakia that was the main target in that period. As the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in December, 1970, pointed out, "the internal offensive of the Right-wing forces was closely bound up with the ideological centres of world anti-Communism" [157].

The plans of imperialism, which the propaganda of revisionism reposed on, determined the way bourgeois "Ukrainology" participated in instigating a "quiet counter-revolution" in Czechoslovakia. One fact that claims attention is

that activities of that kind were to be conducted, first and foremost, by the centres which had earlier been engaged in "research" on the standard subject of "national Communism".

Operating along with them in that campaign was the "Big Press" of the monopolies. Its commentaries indicated that there was a certain script for that campaign to follow and one centre to guide it. That centre, which directed anti-Soviet propaganda under the slogans of "Ukrainian national Communism" was the C.I.A. which cast the "Ukrainologists" in the role of go-betweens between them and the bourgeois press. That is to say that the American intelligence service masterminded many anti-Soviet articles about the Ukraine in newspapers and magazines of the U.S., Canada and West European countries. Edith Kermit Roosevelt, a journalist close to the Right-wing circles in the U.S., stated that one of the channels of distribution of that kind of material was the "New York group of Ukrainian emigres naming themselves 'Prologue' and using sources of the Central Intelligence Agency" [158].

Strange though it may seem, it is the bourgeois press, ever hostile towards the Socialist system, that has now shown itself to be "in sympathy" with the "fighters" for an "improvement" of Socialism, presenting that "improvement", however, as a struggle against "Soviet Communism." For instance, the *International Herald Tribune* described one of the authors of that anti-Soviet piece as a "genuine Communist" while the *Daily Telegraph* called him an "advocate of Lenin's national policy". Among the Sovietologists, who were invited to produce those insinuations about the Ukraine were some of the men who had all along been specializing in falsifying national relations in the U.S.S.R. like Z. Brzezinski, R. Pipes, and F. Barghoorn. Their comments have been quoted by the same Western media.

To encourage counter-revolutionary trends in Czechoslovakia, imperialist elements enlisted the services of Sovietologists as their ideological standard-bearers direct on the territory of that country. What made their job easier was that Czechoslovakia's borders at the time were open, as a matter of fact, to all hostile elements. Brzezinski, one of the theorists of "national Communism", arrived in Czechoslovakia for a conference with anti-Communist elements just before they were to make an attempt at a counter-revolution. There were ideological subversionists from among "Ukrainologists" in the flom of "tourists" and "guests" that streamed in. A representative of the University of Colorado

was sent "on a scientific mission to Europe with appropriate means to establish contact with various scientific circles and institutions." He turned up in Prague for the "Shevchenko" exhibition before proceeding on his way to Bratislava. Other arrivals in Czechoslovakia were "Ukrainologists" from Kansas, Philadelphia and elsewhere [159].

In Czechoslovakia Sovietologists from the U.S. and West Germany were trying to set up an "Association" on an anti-Soviet ground, using the occasion of the "Ukrainological seminar" to that end. As one of the Munich magazines admitted at that time, not all of the "guests" had been invited. It is indicative that the chiefs of Western ethnic organizations involved in that propaganda campaign were explaining to rank-and-file members that "Communist" phraseology which they were playing up had nothing in common with their actual convictions. They wrote in the *Meta* newspaper of Munich in 1968: "However positive we may be in our view of a certain period in the activities of Khvylovy, he cannot be the banner. The banner is, was and will be Symon Petlyura," who is known to have been the mastermind behind the atrocious Jewish pogroms at the time of the Civil War.

In spite of the tremendous efforts of imperialism, its plans with regard to Czechoslovakia fell through. But the imperialists reacted to that flop in their own way. The centres of anti-Communism set about drawing "lessons" from those events with a view to planning and organizing further action against Socialism. Considerable efforts were made for an "exploration" of the possibility of carrying on the propaganda of the concept of "national Communism." Sovietologists from various universities of the U.S., Canada, and Australia — those of Michigan, New York City, Yale, McMaster, Toronto and the Australian National — were mobilized to collect appropriate material. One of them, P. Potichnyj was granted a special scholarship. In co-authorship with G. Hodnett, he compiled a "study" postulating "liberal national Communism" for further scheming against Socialist countries. In that context, the authors of that book laid special emphasis on material manipulating quotations from Lenin's writings on ethnic relations policy detached from their context and deliberately misinterpreted. At the same time, they indicated the opportunities to step up propaganda against the Ukraine [160].

A number of American Sovietologists joined that dirty business of twisting the Ukraine's history of the '20s and '30s in tune with the "topical" slogans of imperialist

propaganda. For instance, the monograph by J. Mace, published 1983, purported to "cover" what it described as "national Communism in the Soviet Ukraine." But all he had to offer to his readers was a rehash of shopworn arguments of Western historiography of as early as the '50s and '60s about autarchy, parochialism and things like that [161].

Still appealing to them, the licensed "Ukrainologists" pursue the same objective of undermining the unity of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and other countries. That is a trend which is most clearly to be seen in the light of the programmes drawn up in the early '70s. For instance, the paper presented by P. Zinner at the Columbia University conference laid accent on the treatment of the history and the contemporary situation in the Socialist countries in the spirit of the postulates of "national Communism" [162].

What claims attention in this context is the reference to the need to use "Communist" terminology in propaganda for the U.S.S.R. A report by the U.S. presidential Commission on International Broadcasting regarded such an approach as a "technical" matter. It motivated its proposals in the following way: Soviet people are convinced that "the October Revolution was a progressive event" and that Communism is the goal they have to pursue in their life and work. Therefore, it was suggested that American radio propaganda had to be refined and avoid the "pejorative" use of terminology current in Socialist society [163].

Attempts at presenting the post-war development of the Socialist countries as seen in the light of the concept of "national Communism" have become a standing practice in Sovietology. Its exponents have found it to be their job to discredit the science of Communism, emasculate its internationalist substance by replacing it with nationalism in disguise. The monograph on East European countries and the U.S.S.R., published by the North Western University of the United States, expressed the hope to see Marxism degenerate into an "empty slogan" and replaced by "national Marxism" [164]. In that connection, Sovietologists, including some "Ukrainologists," have developed close co-operation between themselves. One fact to show how it works has been the publication by the Michigan University of an edition prepared by P. Potichnyj, M. Luther, F. Barghoorn, Z. Brzezinski, H. Skilling, G. Luckyj and G. Hodnett. That publication about nationalistic deviationist tendencies which made themselves felt in the years of the Civil War was described by M. Luther in the Foreword as the "first eloquent expression of national Communism". He claimed that it must be

of "interest not only to students of Soviet history, but also to scholars concerned with the international Communist movement and with nationalism as such" [165].

So to spread twisted interpretations of history under the false slogan of "national Communism" has been one of the functions of the bourgeois historiography of the Ukraine. Its propaganda of "national Communism" exhibits one of the tendencies of Sovietology constrained to take into account the continuous consolidation of the forces of social progress in the international arena and the development of the ideas of scientific Communism into a powerful material force. One factor of great methodological significance in exposing such tactics of imperialism and its advocates is the conclusion made by V. I. Lenin in his article "Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx": "The dialectics of history were such that the theoretical victory of Marxism compelled its enemies *to disguise themselves* as Marxists" [166].

6. CLERICAL WAY OF WRITING HISTORY

With the laws of historical development to go by, progressive thought has thoroughly elucidated the social aspects of such phenomena as religion and the Church. The perverse and idealistic vision of the world, imposed by the clericals on the believers, finds expression in more than traditional admonitions and commandments. One of the most distinguishing hallmarks of the social function of the Church is the determination of its exponents to give their own explanation of the historical evolution of any particular people. One can trace this tendency to the clerical trend of historiography which is behind the "study" of the past history and contemporary development of the Ukrainian Republic.

Foreign clericals themselves have an ambitious view of their own activities in the interpretation of Ukrainian history. The proceedings of the conference that took place in Rome with the participation of the Uniate "Theological Scientific Society", for instance, recorded the contention that religion and the Church were "the main subjects" in the study of the history of the Ukraine. Those quarters have been recurrently appealing to the exponents of "Christian Science" to get more involved in historical research. In connection with the millennium of the introduction of Christianity in Kievan Rus' they proclaimed their programmes of studying the "Christian archeology of the Ukraine" and the "Christian economy of the Ukraine" and filled whole pages

of their publications with theorizing to the effect that the object of the students of religions is to delve "into the primary elements of our pro-Christianity". Unlike the authors of other Western publications, they lay accent on the methodology of their "studies" with a view to disproving the materialistic explanation of the historical process in general and that of the Ukraine in particular. Consideration of any particular aspect of social development is closely linked with propaganda of the idealistic principle of interpretation of history.

Some writers have been trying to attain their goal by clothing their publications in the form of a religious and mystical exultation typical of the Church. They have been using practically any event of the past and the present to this end. For instance, in describing the events of 1917-1923 in the Ukraine, a Uniate author, I. Nahayewsky prefaced his narration by his postulate that "people and nations are ruled by the Divine Providence" and that God is "the real and effective power" in history [167]. While advancing such interpretations, clerical historiography has been attacking the scientific precept about the determining role of basis in social existence. Economic factors, its exponents insisted in a Munich publication on *"Religia v zhitti Ukrains'kogo narodu"* (Religion in the Life of the Ukrainian People) "cannot serve as a catalyst of the history of the Ukrainian people right up to our days". The reader will be wasting his time trying to discover any further explanation of that postulate, for there is none. The precept, presented as a scientific one, is proclaimed as one demanding no proof, which is, incidentally, typical of religious dogmatism in general. Yet there are definite calculations to account for this kind of theorizing.

The pompous and ceremonious appeal to ideological methodology is designed to "justify" the contention that religion and the Church are the starting points in historical development. The adepts of "Christian Science", without mincing matters, declare religion and the Church to be among the "major driving forces" of Ukrainian history."

The publications of clerical historiography are full of references to this self-advertizing argument. American Uniate "Ukrainologists" maintain that "the people, the nation and the family" are nothing short of a component part of the Church. In this way, they seek to impose their theocratic credo: the whole of the social structure and its evolution in the Ukraine ever since ancient times has been ... a result of Church activities. In this sense, foreign clericals

have been almost textually repeating, without, it is true, naming them, the long-forgotten theologians of the 19th and the early 20th centuries who similarly enlarged on the "locomotives of history".

While trying to play up the idea of theocracy, modern-day clericals abroad clash with their rivals — exponents of extreme conservatism in bourgeois historiography, which declare the "struggle of nations" to be the Alpha and Omega of all social development. Therefore, the advocates of clericalism afford themselves the luxury of certain criticism of the pattern of the history of the Ukraine which was preached by D. Dontsov, a proponent of racist doctrines and fascism. The course of lectures delivered at the Ukrainian Catholic University in Rome had a reference to something "negative" in Dontsov's writings. That negative element, as clergymen found, consisted "in establishing a nation above everything else... not only above everything terrestrial, but above everything celestial as well" [168]. One should stress the point that the same passage contained complementary allusions to Dontsov's modern-day followers — the ounists who, they claim, have already "digested" the clerical idea of the historical process.

This dispute, essentially scholastic as it is, is indicative in the sense that it reflects the growing ambition of the clerical trend in the foreign historiography of the Ukraine to have its postulates prevail in explaining social life. It is important to know in this context that clerical historiography does not by any means believe the arsenal of versions about everlasting ethnic conflicts to be foreign to it. Its exponents invariably embrace them but only as integral to their own pattern of the history of the Ukraine. One fact to prove that is that it is the Uniate theologians who have put forward the idea of "Christian nationalism" which, as their exponent in the U.S. M. Kushnir argues, "makes it possible to see the world in the light of Providence" [169].

So the reservations of clerical authors reflect the intrinsic contradictions between the exponents of the same world outlook and do not influence what is their common trend to present the ideology of ethnic intolerance in Christian colours.

The true essence of the reliance of Uniate clericals on the concepts of ethnic insularity and ethnic superiority is to be seen in the attempts made to vilify the "doctrine of internationalism" which is espoused by the working class and which, according to the adepts of "Christian science", pursues its "self-seeking interests". By twisting facts in

this way, some clericals would like to distort the essence of proletarian internationalism which is known to express the interests not only of the working class itself, but those of all working people, that is, the vast majority of the population. On the other hand, they have been at pains to present the policy and ideology of the exploiting minority as a general national and common popular phenomenon. The true nature of clerical writings is particularly manifest in the advocacy of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism which has caused untold suffering to the Ukrainian people. It means, in plain terms, whitewashing those who, invoking nationalist ideas, committed hideous crimes on Ukrainian soil.

That the misinterpreted nationalist principles constitute the groundwork for a clerical "study of the Ukraine" is quite manifest in the treatment of the ancient Russian State — Kievan Rus' — as "Ukrainian" and its population as "Ukrainians." Those who say so appear to be in no way embarrassed by the fact that what existed in the period in question was an integrated ancient Russian nationality.

It is the advocates of the Uniate Church that have been particularly zealous in attempting to galvanize what has found neither confirmation nor recognition in historical science. They use their own wishful thinking in an effort to prove the "Christian Church" to have been the decisive factor in the history of this country. Accordingly, the emphasis is on subjects relating to the introduction of Christianity in Rus'. Clericals qualify that event as "the beginning of Ukrainian history", "formation of the Ukrainian people", thereby distorting the actual meaning of the events concerned.

It is indicative that clerical historiography does not, apparently, share the interpretations of foreign historians who stand contrary to all logic, by dating the formation of the Ukrainian people from the Neolithic Age. Clericals sacrifice this pseudodiscovery to their own policy of playing up the Christian religion as the starting point in the development of Eastern Slavonic tribes. Hence the dating is from the "Christianization" of the ancient Russian lands.

Clericals have been trying to attribute the fast political, economic and cultural advance of the early feudal State in the East of Europe to the appearance of institutionalized religion in the ambit of public life. They ignore facts that prove the introduction of the Christian Church to have been one of the consequences of the emergence and development of feudal relations in Rus' and the evolution of a fledgling feudal State. It is at that stage that the Church,

alongside the dukes, became the owner of farmland, settlements and exploiter of farm labour. That is to say that clerical scribes misrepresent the cause-and-effect connection of the events in their efforts to extol the Christian Church as the major protagonist of the development of Kievan Rus'.

It is the Uniate authors that have been particularly prolific in their apologetic writings on the "Christianization" of Rus'. Yet that is by no means a sign of anything like their sympathy for Byzantine religion. The point, it turns out, is that these authors seek to give all credit for the process of Christianization and whatever positive things religion did in building up the State in its early stages to the papacy. To that end, the Uniate publications refer to the Christianity introduced under the dukedom of Vladimir, as a rule, as "Ukrainian" or just "Christian" religion. Whenever they have to take a closer look at it, clericals admit that Christianization resulted from the contact the Kievan dukes had with Byzantium. But the reason why they do make such a confession is because they go on to claim that Rus' owed the introduction of Christianity to Catholic Rome, in the long run. The "argument" to prove it is that the Byzantine Church was "in unity with the Rome Church at the time" [170], because the division of the Christiandom into two Churches — Western and Eastern — finally took shape as late as 1054, that is, some time after the introduction of Christianity in Rus'. However, foreign interpreters fail to say that the actual division had occured much earlier than that. There had emerged two independent centres of Christianity — those of Byzantium and Rome — locked in a scramble for spheres of influence, centuries before the events just mentioned. Consequently, there is no ground for speaking of any unity of the two Churches, still less for believing the Byzantine Church to have been executing the will of the Roman centre.

Excursions of Uniate authors into the history of Kievan Rus' are, as the facts show, nothing but an ill intention to present the papacy, known to have pursued a hostile policy towards the Eastern Slavs for centuries on end, as the driving force of their development. To this end, they have been twisting and turning any episodes relating in one way or another to the operation of the Roman centre of those days. For instance, they present the Varangians and legate missionaries as the main exponents of the Christian religion in Rus', while showing the Byzantines as the last to preach it. Yet at the same time, they overstate the im-

portance of the action of some dukes who resorted to the aid of foreign feudals and even to the services of the Popes in their fratricidal scramble for power. For instance, the fact of an appeal from Izyaslav to Gregory VII to help him tame his unruly subjects served to make the hasty conclusion about Rome's "guardianship" over the ancient Russian State [171]. The Uniate authors of the "guardianship" story make no mention, of course, of the fact that Izyaslav's flight arose from attempts to quell a rebellion in Kiev in 1068-1069 against feudal oppression and domination by foreign troops [172].

While playing up the prescribed argument about the "sympathy" of the papacy for the ancient "Ruthenians", clericals have been making a slanted selection of material, laying accent on the personalities that held the throne of Rome and had something to do with the East in their activities. One example of such advocacy can be found in the elucidation of the "East European policy" of Innocentius IV. It has been claimed that the main point of his pontificate, as well as that of all East European policy, was to remove the "Tartar menace" by a "crusade of the peoples of Europe" [173]. However, there is documentary evidence that shows quite the opposite: while Rus' was bleeding white under Golden Horde sway, the main preoccupation of Innocentius IV was to implant Catholic rule in the Russian lands by force. One particular piece of evidence to prove it was his letter of March 3, 1246, to the Prussian Archbishop, enjoining him to appoint Catholic Bishops and clergymen "on the territory of Rus'" and "pay no regard" to the appeals of the opponents of this action [174].

To embellish the policy of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in respect of the Eastern Slavs, Uniate historians began to publish collections of documents since the early '50s, extracted from the Vatican archives. However biassed the compilers might have been in selecting the material, they failed to conceal altogether the aggressive ambitions of the papacy, which was something that the exponents of Western Slavic studies have drawn attention to. It has been pointed out that the two-volume edition of documents published by the Uniate Church was devoted to "clerical propaganda". That is just what "put the editor into a rather difficult position. He has to show that the Roman Church in its policy toward the Orthodox Ukrainians made no mistakes. But the facts adduced in these documents testify to the contrary". The documents thus published, the magazine sums up,

"show the weakness of the position of the Roman Church among the Ukrainian people" [175].

In an effort to prove the Roman Centre to have been involved in the introduction of Christianity and extol its Eastern policy, the Uniate authors had to admit in the long run that this development intensified the Russian-Byzantine links. Yet the very fact of those links having been established at all receives a purely negative assessment. Writings by A. Welykyj maintain that they caused Rus' to be isolated "from the entire cultural world" to which the anti-Roman compositions of Metropolitans and Greek monks also contributed [176].

All these passages show that the concept of "cultural world" was seen in Uniate treatises as being confined to the operation of the Catholic centre. In this way, the Roman throne was credited with what would have been an excessive function of a carrier of the culture of all Europe in those days. There are countless historical facts which are, naturally, left out of account in Uniate writings, to show how far-fetched and groundless is the proposed concept of the history of the distant past. The story of the isolation of Rus' does not square at all with the fact that her external links, particularly, those with West European countries, had increased considerably. Allied relations were developed with Poland, the German Empire, Scandinavian States and France during the reign of Yaroslav, the Wise. Book writing and translation gained wide currency in Rus'. The best of achievements of foreign architecture, sculpture and painting became well known here.

Clericals have been particularly voluble about the Galich-Volhyn dukedom which is explained, above all, by the presence of such a period in its history when Rome and Galicia maintained diplomatic relations which are, however, seen in the light of one "problem" — whether or not it was from the Pope of Rome personally that Prince Daniil of Galich received his royal crown. Most clerical historians deny that fact, but interpret the connection that did take place in the sense of "the strong influence of Western civilization" (that is, once more, the Roman Church) on the dukedom [177]. They do not want to delve into the character of relationship between the dukedom and the Roman throne. Uniate historiography makes no mention at all of the fact that Daniil of Galich's appeal to Rome was dictated by motives that were anything but religious. Its exponents pretend that there is no other interpretation and that there is no Soviet literature and even no foreign publications that

contain facts to testify that the whole point in the relationship with Rome was about organizing resistance to the Golden Horde invasion of Rus'. As a far-sighted statesman and diplomat, the Duke sought to establish a common front in action against the legions of conquerors who were pressing from the East and draw the Polish and Lithuanian Dukes as well as the Pope of Rome into action against them That is the only explanation of why Daniil of Galich agreed to accept his royal title from Rome. But what the papal office had in mind was something entirely different — making the population Catholic and bringing the dukedom under its own control, without ever considering any real aid to it. Once he was aware of that, Daniil of Galich changed his tactics and severed his relation with Rome. Clerical historiography has to admit the fact of that severance of relationship because it is recorded in papal epistles published in collections of Vatican documents, notably in the Message of February 13, 1257, in which Alexander IV rebuked the Russian Prince for having "disobeyed the Catholic Church" [178]. But that fact, too, was presented as an event caused by purely religious differences. That was, properly speaking, all there was in the Uniate record of the history of the relationship between Galich and Rome. However, even a number of publications of American historiography, which on the whole, are far from giving a true picture of this country's past history, pointed out the true reason behind the conflict in Galich-papal relations. For instance, *A History of the Russian Empire* by N. Chirovsky treated these relations as a political treaty designed to counter the Golden Horde. Getting no military aid, the author states, Daniil of Galich became "fully disillusioned" over papal policy [179].

Turning to the events of the national liberation movement in the time of feudalism, foreign clericals guide themselves in their interpretations by the argument that there was no papal co-operation in the struggle against the Ukrainian people. Being unable to deny the commonly known facts of wholesale violence against the Ukrainian population in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the exponents of "Christian science" seek to obscure the fact that it was the papal office that had masterminded that aggressive policy.

It should be noted that collections of Vatican documents published in the West contain individual items referring to papal support for the hostile policy of the Polish feudals. Naturally, these items have no direct allusions to the so-

cial motives of the struggle that got under way in the Ukraine at the time; the documents were written by clergymen and their descriptions of the events were in mystified form. That is exactly what modern-day pseudo-scholars in the West have been exploiting. They have interpreted the "defence of the Union" and the "eradication of heresy", urged by the Vatican, as action in the interest of the Ukrainian people. While compelled to acknowledge what were the dire consequences of the "war against schismatics" for the Ukraine, the Uniate authors put the blame for it only on the Polish King and the local Church hierarchy. In a review of Ukrainian history, I. Nahayewsky maintains that "the Holy See of Rome vehemently protested, exhorting the King and Latin Rite hierarchy to spring to the defence of their brethren of the Byzantine Rite, inasmuch as all concerned were sons of one mother — the Catholic Church" [180]. But the facts totally disprove the argument about the "defence of the Orthodox Brothers." Urban VIII's messages to King Sigismund III unequivocally urged the use of arms to suppress "schismatic heresy" which penetrated the Cossack ranks [181]. What the Uniate clericals called a defence of the Ukrainian people was, is effect, their massacre.

It is indicative that the treatment presented by some American and other foreign historians concerned with the history of the Ukraine are just of a piece with clerical interpretations. Although many of them admit the occurrence of social and political conflicts in the said period, yet they try to present the activities of the Catholic Church and the Uniate clergy as having had nothing to do with them. Some of them discover the initiative of the Polish Catholic authorities in the establishment of a "new, Uniate" branch of the Church [182], while others put that event down to the will of the Vatican, noting that conversion into "Catholic" faith came along with declaring those who resisted it to be "rebels and heretics" [183]. These historians as well as clerical writers put religious motives before anything else to explain the action of the Catholic higher-ups. They ignore the typical and natural occurrence of class warfare in the Middle Ages, the fact that "the class struggles of that day were clothed in religious shibboleths" and that "the interests, requirements, and demands of the various classes were concealed behind a religious screen" [184].

In recent times, foreign clerical publications on the Ukraine have been more and more prolific in contentions that the Church was "about the only carrier" of culture in the Ukraine for a whole millennium. While producing their

ambitious precepts, clerical authors try to cash in on the argument that the Church served as a factor promoting cultural advance at the time of the Christianization of Rus'. Yet they feign ignorance of the fact that the involvement of the clergy in the spread of literacy and in the enlistment of architects, artists and sculptors were intended, above all, to further the interests of the clergy and describe these activities as Christianity's aim in itself. Moreover, Christianity was proclaimed to be the parent of all culture along the Dnieper. Naturally, clericals omit to mention that cultural advance in those areas had begun long before the appearance of Christianity — written languages were widespread in the Russian lands, works of art were produced, etc. Oleg and other Russian princes used written treaties in concluding international agreements, while merchants used them in drawing up their commercial transactions. Attempts at presenting culture as a result of nothing but the activities of the clergy in the early feudal period do not square with the facts of history which indicate that it was not only the monasteries and other religious institutions that were its centres. Cultural advance proceeded outside the Church as well, witness the ducal libraries, widespread literacy among the boyar estate and a relatively wide cross-section of the population, and it was stimulated by real factors such as the development of arts and handicrafts which required some categories of masters to have at least a primitive knowledge of reading rules, etc. Clerical historiography makes no mention in its publications either of the forcible implanting of Christianity which adversely affected culture. What I refer to is the widespread destruction by missionaries of ancient Russian cultural monuments under the pretext of fighting paganry.

Clericalism has been at pains most often to present the cultural mission of the Church in the West Ukrainian lands where the Uniate clergy, with the backing of foreign invaders, had been building a base of support for itself for centuries on end to exploit the local population. One can see this trend at work in the attempt at "elucidating" the state of culture in Galicia in the 19th-early 20th centuries. The fact of the Austrian monarchy's surrender of school education to the clergy has been played up for unrestrained glorification of the Uniate clergy. However, with the Church involved in school education, the number of schools in Galicia declined, and the vast majority of children, mostly from working people's families, was deprived even of primary schooling[185]. What kind of the enlightenment mission of

the Uniate Church can one talk about, considering that clergymen were up against any attempts at equipping people with any stock of knowledge? Suffice it to turn, for instance, to the analytical assessments given by Ivan Franko, the great Ukrainian revolutionary democrat, poet and scholar. In considering the literature produced by the Uniate pundits "for the people", he pointed out that it was "clerical" in character and that "the majority of the clergy look askance at anything like free thinking [186]. The Uniate pseudo-enlighteners were among those who turned the Western Ukraine into a land with literacy at an extremely low level.

At the same time, the collection of stories *From the Chronicle of the Christian Ukraine*, published in Rome in 1976, represented an attempt at attributing what was real cultural achievement to the activities of the Uniate hierarchs. One episode that was typical in that respect was a misrepresentation of the history of the famous almanac *The Mermaid of the Dniestr* based on the fact that the publishers and the main authors of the Almanac were seminary students — M. Shashkevich, I. Vagilevich and J. Golovacky. The collection omits to mention that right from the start the Uniate top leadership were opposed to the publication of the Almanac and banned it. Therefore, an Almanac, which had the people as the main character and glorified their struggle for liberation, was printed in Budapest. Nor do the clericals say anything about the fact that right after its publication, the Almanac was impounded and its publishers interrogated, harassed and hounded by churchmen and police.

In "examining" various periods of history, Uniate clericals and trans-Atlantic Sovietologists along with them have undertaken a terminological manipulation in the post-war period with regard to the characterization of the Uniate Church. In their studies, they normally avoid using the official name of the "Greek Catholic Church" which the Uniate clergy exploited to cover up its dirty tricks in the West Ukrainian lands. Instead, they use the terms "Ukrainian" or "Ukrainian Catholic Church." This substitution is due to political considerations and attempts to adapt historical material to the new objectives of their propaganda. Clerical and bourgeois historiography is literally inundated with instances of such "modernization". The point is that this spate of renamings has everything to do with the attempts of clericals and Sovietologists to present the Uniate clergy as a "national Church" [187].

Accordingly, they spare no effort to present the Uniate clergy as a vehicle of the "national spirit" of the Ukrainian people. Showing the Greek-Catholic Church in "national" and "Ukrainian" colours, clericals and Sovietologists have been trying to deny the well-justified termination of its activities in 1946 and present the very Act of the Lvov Cathedral as the policy of the authorities designed to "extirpate" national features from the life of the Ukrainians. Such attempts are as groundless as they are futile for they are designed to misguide the readers who are ill-informed about the history of the matter in question. First, the Uniate clergy has no right to claim to be anything like a carrier of the national features of the Ukrainian people for the simple reason that they have always been a weapon of foreign oppressors and the very act of the Union which produced the Greek-Catholic Church is an act of the Catholic hierarchy and the Polish feudals. For centuries, the Union has been considered by the mass of the Ukrainian people as a foreign yoke and invited resistance which developed into armed struggles. Second, even at the time when it was most widespread, the Uniate religion was never shared by the majority, let alone the entire Ukrainian population. One fact to bear that out is that it succeeded in getting entrenched in some of the Ukrainian lands — in Galicia and in the sub-Carpathian regions — only with the help of foreign oppressors. Finally, the Uniate Church demonstrated their genuine political complexion — anti-national and anti-Ukrainian — during the Second World War, when it owned the policy of the Third Reich and consecrated the fascist crusade against the Soviet Union and the Soviet Ukraine, and, in particular, offered all manner of support to Hitler's agents — the OUN bandits — in their crimes against the local population [188].

While passing all that over, Western authors try to picture the Uniate hierarchs as "fighters" for the destiny of the Ukrainian people. These adepts of "Christian science" have been forever at pains to withhold all information about Uniate action against the people in the Nazi-occupied Ukraine. A number of historians have been trying to oppose their own "evidence" and "information" to the extensive Soviet publications exposing the facts as they are, which certain quarters in the West have to reckon with [189].

This campaign involves a painstaking face-lifting effort to disguise the head of the Greek-Catholic Church, Szeptyckyj, coupled with awkward attempts to present him as a "defender" of the people. Exponents of clerical historio-

graphy acting hand in glove with Sovietologists, have been circulating fake stories about Szeptyckyj's humane attitude to Catholics, the Orthodox believers, and the followers of Judaism. This disinformation sounds discordant with the true facts, notably with the Vatican documents which are occasionally cited and commented on by foreign students relying in their conclusions on unfounded passages from professional falsifiers rather than on hard facts, witness, for instance, the work by an Italian historian, Carlo Falconi, devoted to the activities of Pius XII. He referred to the conduct of the head of the Greek-Catholic Church in 1942 when the leaders of various nations called on the Pope to speak up against Nazi crimes in the territory of the German-occupied Polish State. As noted in the study, Szeptyckyj was among those who denied there was any need for the Pope to denounce fascist terrorism on the grounds that the "persecutions", you see, had not yet caused the "mass martyrdom" of the believers (which was a gross misrepresentation of the actual facts). "If the persecution," Szeptyckyj wrote in one of his letters to the Vatican, "takes the form of massacre for the cause of religion, it may well be the salvation of this country. There is an enormous need for blood voluntarily offered up" [190]. These documents of Szeptyckyj's expose him as an advocate of fascist terrorism as he really was along with the disgusting nature of the writings by those who have ever taken up the cudgels in favour of that sinister character.

As to the actual coverage of the Soviet period, the main subject of the Uniate writings has been the history of the events connected with the termination of the activities of the Greek-Catholic Church in the Ukraine. The stereotype used by their authors has been taken up unchanged by Sovietologists. Not even the publishers of the *Encyclopedia Americana*, pretending to be "respectable", refrained from getting involved in this unseemly campaign. It has an entry which, contrary to commonly known facts, asserts that the "Ukrainian Catholic Church" (at this point, again, the reader was given the "modernized" name of the Uniate Church — Ed.) was "outlawed by the Soviet government after World War II" [191]. One has to note in this case that they have been looking for the reasons to renounce the Union in some external circumstances instead of the very essence of the Uniate hierarchy's activities, as I said earlier on.

The authors who claim to be experts on religion would, of course, like to hold Soviet atheism responsible for the

severance of the Union. Charges against atheism have been the basic propositions in one of the latest books by D. Dunn who referred to the Greek-Catholic Church as supposedly liquidated on orders from the official authorities [192]. He goes on to argue that it was "the irreconcilability of atheistic and theistic world views" that was the source of "Soviet-Catholic antagonism". As to the irreconcilability of the two world outlooks, Dunn does not, of course, discover any America — that has been acknowledged in the writings of the pioneers of Marxism-Leninism. There is another point which is important: the author quotes no Marxist propositions to the effect that this irreconcilability has the hallmarks of ideological struggle. He claims the propaganda of atheism in the Ukraine is government-sponsored. His argument about the background to the collapse of the Union does not hold water, even if you go by the logic of the author himself. Once atheism, as Dunn argues, has been government-sponsored, it would have been only natural for the religious premises of the Uniate Church to be closed down upon the severance of the Union. Yet that has not happened. The Church premises which passed into the ownership of the Orthodox Church continued to function and the believers continued to visit them, while the former Uniate clergymen, having joined the Orthodox Church, continued to minister their services.

So, Uniate historiography and the centres of Sovietology, which have been trying to give their own interpretation of the history of the Ukraine, are based on anti-scientific principles, suffering from anti-historism. The issue of their treatises has been connected with the special role that the proponents of confrontation between the East and the West want the writing of the history of the "Christian Ukraine" to play — that is, to prove the unprovable — the right of the Uniate clergy to represent the interests of the Ukrainian people and to conduct hostile propaganda against the Socialist system under the umbrella of theological science.

While doctoring history to please the politicians, foreign clerical authors are closely co-operating with the centres of Sovietology which borrow all kinds of false stories and stereotypes from the Uniate publications. One must see the roots of that harmony in the shifts taking place in bourgeois ideology towards irrationalism and non-recognition of the major realities of the modern world. On the other hand, this has been due to the overall orientation of politicized Sovietology towards misrepresenting the history

of this country and trying to prove Socialism to be "unnatural" and the capitalist system to be "eternal."

All this goes to show that the present-day Uniate writing of history is one of the forms of political clericalism used by imperialism against the forces of social progress.

* * *

The material just reviewed warrants the conclusion that the Western historiography of the Ukraine is a widely politicized branch of social science. What predominates in its conceptualizing stock-in-trade is a set of schemes and interpretations that play into the hands of the inspirers of imperial thinking with their aims of opposing progressive social and economic change in the world and relying on counter-revolutionary action to forestall this change.

The connection of bourgeois historiography with imperialist policy serves to sharpen its reactionary interpretations. The main object of the unending attacks of "Ukrainologists" is the historical experience of the Ukrainian people, indicating that only in the closest-ever alliance and unity with the great Russian people and the other sister nations could they uphold their freedom, build Socialism, regain what had been their land from time out of mind, and acquire everything they need to promote their all-round social and national progress.

CONCLUSION

The historical experience gained in the process of building a new way of life in the U.S.S.R. is an inestimable ideological asset for all progressive humanity. For the peoples of the world this country is an embodiment of great Socialist ideals and true humanism. The Soviet record of social, economic, cultural and intellectual progress holds the attention of scores of nations, for history has no other example of so fast a transition by a nation from a state of backwardness and privation to that of power and prosperity.

Each of the constituent Republics making up the great Soviet Union has been making an irreplaceable contribution to overall national economic and cultural advance. And that is not just an addition but a multiplication of their creative forces. It is due to the participation in this historical activity of the commonwealth of sister republics that the Ukrainian people have risen to the summits of modern progress. The intervening decades have seen the rapid growth of the Ukraine's economic potential. Industrial production has increased by nearly 300 times. The Ukraine is producing as much electricity per head as Britain or France, and appreciably more steel and rolled metal than the industrialized countries of Western Europe. All that is a clear indication of the triumph of the Leninist ethnic relations policy of the Communist Party.

The achievements the Soviet Union and each of its constituent Republics gain in every aspect of life, while imparting strength and enthusiasm to the champions of social progress all over the world, cause imperialist reaction to hate the system that has ensured the free development of peoples without exploitation and violence. Imperialism is bending every nerve to counter the impact that the record of Socialist development has on the other peoples of this planet. To do so, there is a ramified Sovietological set-up using historiography to falsify the past history and present realities of the Soviet Union.

Pre-conceived false concepts and interpretations of Ukrainian history are used for this purpose. As a special system, these "studies" are a typical outgrowth of the imperialist stage of capitalism when the ruling exploited classes have launched a full-scale drive to create special institutions for the ideological indoctrination of the masses. The bourgeois historiography of the Ukraine and the "Ukrainian studies" in general, which have emerged in the U.S. and some other Western countries in the post-war period, are one of the results of these actions.

The material under review makes it possible to trace the involvement of the "Ukrainian studies" in the machinery of politics, their direct or indirect connection with the government institutions, their financing out of government budgets, by the military-industrial complex, etc.

The interpretations of the Ukraine's past history and present realities by bourgeois historiography have, as one can see from an abundance of facts, become integral to the system of imperialism's ideological activities against the forces of social progress and peace. "Ukrainological" interpretations serve as repositories of claims consonant both with the slogans of inveterate reaction and stereotypes of the elements which argue they are trying to rise "above politics". Proper consideration for the multiformity of this historiography is one of the conditions of an objectified and differentiated analysis of its concepts and versions and attraction of special attention to the questions of exposing the most harmful of them to social development.

The character of "Ukrainological" concepts is quite easy to see in their ideological content formed essentially by anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism. The denial of the new, Socialist system is to be seen, first, in the distortions of the history of Soviet society and of the construction of Socialism in the Ukrainian Republic. Second, a distinguishing feature of these interpretations is an ambition to "cover" the political, economic and other development in the history of the Ukrainian Republic in the context of imperialist propaganda priorities. Third, they represent quite a proportion of the ideological paraphernalia of the most reactionary forces — those of the former Hitler Reich and the present-day movement of the Right and ultra-Right in the capitalist countries.

One of the particular features present in the Western writings on the history and modern realities of the Ukrainian Republic is that they quite often make common cause with the advocacy of anti-Socialist counter-revolution. While

constructing a perverse concept of life in the Ukrainian Republic, the lieutenants of reaction strive to vilify actual Socialism as a fundamentally new and higher stage of social development and impress the need for a restoration of capitalism.

The findings of research underline the relevance of the assessment of anti-Communism, which usually starts its campaigns by mud-slinging against the U.S.S.R., as a weapon of imperialist and reactionary forces in their struggle not only against Communism, but against other democrats and democratic freedoms as well.

Falsifying the Leninist ethnic relations policy of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its implementation in the Ukraine is part and parcel of politicized historiography in the West. This is the purpose both of "historical research" and the "analysis" of the present-day development of the Ukraine. Serving it, too, is the misrepresentation of the Ukrainian people's history prior to the October Revolution. The major thrust of such interpretations is to distort the essence of the fraternal friendship and co-operation of the Ukrainian and Russian peoples and, fulfilling the order of anti-Communism, vilify one of the fundamental principles of Socialism — the principle of friendship among the peoples.

In noting the introduction of concepts of reactionary nationalism in Sovietological centres, one should emphasize that it has occurred at a time when it, as a political trend, has lost its positions in the Ukraine, having forever forfeited its social base here. The full-scale drive now on to galvanize the ideology of the Ukrainian bourgeoisie to suit, above all, the extreme Right-wing elements in the West, is fundamental to the modern Western historiography of the Ukraine.

The ideology of the exploiter classes long since swept off the stage of public life in the Ukraine is intergrated in the "brainwashing" system because of such a factor as the community of its social essence with the ideology of the modern-day governing quarters in capitalist countries. It should be underlined that the ideology of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism, which discredited itself altogether by its subservience to the adepts of German fascism, has far from always shown itself up "unadulterated". While some "Ukrainological" publications still try to insist on "nationalism" as synonymous with "patriotism", what they actually mean in most cases is the alleged "nationalism" of the Ukrainian people.

Falsified interpretations of Ukrainian history operate as one of the instruments of imperialism in its attempts to undermine the solidarity of the working people of different national ethnic backgrounds. Nationalism and counter-revolutionary demagogy closely intertwine with militarist tendencies. Many "Ukrainological" centres owe their very involvement in propaganda campaign as well as their actual emergence and development and the form of their organization of "research" and staff training, to the military-industrial complex. In present-day circumstances, with reactionary forces never becoming less aggressive, the pro-militarist orientation of a number of Sovietologists clearly operates as an instrument at work to keep up the fraud about a "Soviet military threat". This propaganda is conducted in the interests of forces seeking to prevent international detente, justify the arms race and push humanity down the abyss of a thermonuclear war. Historiographic speculation is directly used as ideological cover for armed action. In view of that, one cannot fail to see the danger that the activities of a wide range of "scientific" centres bred by the military pose for the cause of peace. Having become a conglomeration of hard-trained opponents of Socialism, they operate as one of the impersonifications of the revolting essence of imperialist predatory policies along with its encroachments on the freedom and independence of peoples, arms race, banking on aggression and reckless action in politics.

Being unable to face the truth of history in an open battle, the advocates of imperialist political domination over social science are trying to cover up its ideological poverty with lying assertions about the democratic and Socialist slogans increasingly current in the world today. This is what the centres which have committed themselves to the propaganda of the so-called "national Communism" are most busily working on. Their pronouncements from the alleged positions in favour of "improved Socialism" are evidence of an indirect recognition of the invincible force and continuing rising popularity of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism all over the world. At the same time, such tactics furnish more evidence of the scientific inconsistency of the representatives of these centres, compelled to resort to political mimicry and the "stealing of slogans". Their attempts to pose as "good-wishers" of the Ukrainian people constitute subtle ideological action.

One of the conclusions arising from an examination of the connections between bourgeois historiography and the

imperialist system of mass communications consists in the fact that by its "works" this historiography contributes towards the application of methods transplanted from the arsenal of subversive actions into the area of ideology and tailored to the prosecution of psychological warfare.

As my analysis shows, the attempts to depict Western "Ukrainological" writings as "Ukrainian science" are totally unfounded. It is the social and class criteria that offer the only right clue for an understanding of the essence of this occurrence as a derivative of the imperialist Establishment of the U.S. and some other capitalist States. Hence, there is no consistency about the Western practice to use the term "Ukrainian historiography" as applied to modern-day foreign studies on the history of the Ukraine. The object of such jugglery is to disguise the true source of anti-Sovietism most of them preach — imperialist claimants to world domination. The fairly wide reference made at Sovietological centres to the concepts of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalistic historiography, which functioned in the Ukraine before the Revolution and in the Western Ukrainian lands before the war, means trying to adjust its stock-in-trade to serving the purposes and objectives of the policy of confrontation on the world scene opposed by millions.

The emergence of the constantly changing system of Sovietology is one of the indications of the intensification and growing complexity of the ideological battle in the world, of a quest by imperialism for new methods, resources, and stratagems to be used in it. Hence, in order to understand the objectives behind many Sovietological interpretations, one should not forget that the "Ukrainian studies", which present themselves more and more often in refined form, continue to turn to Cold War stereotypes. The use of Cold War rhetorics betrays the actual design of the masterminds of this propaganda to influence persons with a low level of political consciousness and little knowledge of the history of Soviet society.

The fact that the bourgeois treatment of the historical problems of the Ukraine is in tune with the policy and propaganda of imperialism testifies to the growing and deepening crisis of the ideology of the exploiter system. Bereft of positive ideals to meet the aspirations and ambitions of the working people, this treatment is counter-productive in the historical plane. Its subjectivism leads to denying the only correct materialistic understanding of historical development. The writings made to pander to the interests of propaganda are using presentism, that "moderni-

zes" the historical past to justify and "motivate" the current plans and practical activities of reaction, as the basic methodological principle of investigating the history of the Ukraine. The subjectivistic demands of the governing oligarchy, which run counter to the major trend of the historical process are, in the long run, basic to "Ukrainological" falsifications. Hence an arbitrary interpretation of the sources, ignoring the "unpaying" facts of history, etc. This is a feature that Western centres do acknowledge from time to time. In reviewing an abstract *Nationalism and Human Rights*, published in the U.S., a Sovietological journal, *Russian Review*, far from showing any sympathy for Socialism, still hinted that the Ukraine's past was presented in that book from the standpoint of political doctrines and called that particular specimen of presentism, "historical stylization" [1].

Moreover, the Sovietological theory of the history of the Ukraine is by itself of a presentist character, alleging that the "struggle between nations" is the main driving force of the history and present-day development of the Ukrainian people. The slanted choice of the subject matter and falsification of the historical development of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic serves to "justify" that fundamentally unjustifiable argument. This theory devotes a lot of space to the advocacy of organizations, opposed to the powerful social movement in the Ukraine and using "national slogans" as cover, which appeared at the turn of the century. Such writings are based on the subjects which, as their authors and customers conceive it, must "prove" the "natural" proclivity of the Ukrainian people for the capitalist system. This is what accounts for the systematic publications of books and articles about the doings of the Central Rada, Directory and other Counter-Revolutionary organizations of 1917-1920, "research studies" on nationalistic deviationism of the '20s, the anti-people activities of reactionary churchmen and so on and so forth.

So the contemporary bourgeois theory of the history of the Ukraine rests on a distorted reflection of the actual processes, while projecting particular occurrences into general developments without any ground whatsoever.

The attempts made to explain the historical past and present-day development from positions of advocacy of anti-people forces betray their total inconsistency. The course of world events is there to show that it is impossible to reveal the truth of history and the laws behind societal development outside the most influential ideological school of

thought in the context of world civilization — Marxism-Leninism. "It indicates the way to a scientific study of society's development as an integral process that is law-governed in all its huge diversity and contradictoriness...", General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev stressed in the Political Report to the 27th Party Congress.

The scientific value and democracy, revolutionary appeal and humanism of this science show it to be fundamentally different from the ideology of imperialism which is designed to justify and bless the exploitative scheme of things and aggressive policies, and to preach national strife, chauvinism and racism. Unlike it, Marxism-Leninism attracts the minds and hearts of millions by its veracity and honesty, integrity and optimism. This is the science of the new kind of society, the science working for peace, social progress, co-operation and friendship among nations.

Reconstruction developing now in all spheres of the Soviet society being revolutionary in its essence is a convincing evidence of the Marxism-Leninism vitaility, the tremendous potential embodied in the socialism. Reconstruction is an invitation of the socialism to a peaceful competition with another social system which is represented, in particular, by western sovietology as well. But for this competition to develop in the civilized forms, according to the fair remark by M. S. Gorbachev in his speech at the international forum "For Nuclear-Free World, for Survival of the Mankind", "one needs **new thinking,** one needs to overcome views, stereotypes and dogmata inherited from the past gone never to return" [3]. And it means that ideological differences and arguments which exist in our interdependent world should not be a ground for confrontation between states and peoples, military confrontation in particular, threatening the human civilization existence itself.

REFERENCES AND FOOTNOTES

CHAPTER I

[1] American Foreign Policy in International Perspective.— Prentice-Hall, New Jersey, 1971.— P. 34.
[2] America's Weapons of Psychological Warfare.— New York, 1951.— P. 34.
[3] *Burnham J.* Containment or Liberation? — New York, 1952.— P. 86, 137, 231.
[4] United States Foreign Policy: USSR and Eastern Europe.— Washington, 1960.— P. 77.
[5] *Brzezinski Z.* Between Two Ages.— New York, 1970.— P. 161.
[6] Slavic Review.— 1967.— N 3.— P. 493.
[7] *Fedyshyn O.* Germany's Drive to the East and Ukrainian Revolution, 1917-1918.— New Brunswick, 1971.— P. 3.
[8] The Ukrainians in America, 1608-1975: A Chronology and Fact Book.— New York, 1976.— P. 83.
[9] *White T.* America in Search of Itself: The Making of the President, 1956-1980.— New York, 1982.— P. 369.
[10] *Pipes R.* The Formation of the Soviet Union: Communism and Nationalism, 1917-1923.— Cambridge (Mass.), 1954.
[11] A Decade of American Foreign Policy: Basic Documents, 1941-1949.— New York, 1969.— P. 1234.
[12] The Ukrainian Quarterly.— 1977.— N 3.— P. 326.
[13] *Bogart L.* Premises for Propaganda.— New York, 1976.— P. 18.
[14] The U.S. News and World Report.— 1972.— May 1.— P. 50, 52.
[15] Problems of Communism.— 1972.— N 5.— P. 79-84.
[16] *Holt P.* United States Policy in Foreign Affairs.— Boston, 1971.— P. 98.
[17] Congressional Record.— 1974.— Jan. 24.
[18] Ibid.— 1976.— Jan. 20.— P. E53.
[19] U. S. Congress House: Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression: Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine.— Washington, 1954.— (Spec. Report, N 4).
[20] Svoboda.— 1974.— May 11, 18.
[21] Congressional Record.— 1955.— Jan. 27.— P. A491.
[22] *Holt P.* Op. cit.— P. 103.
[23] *Kennan G.* Memoirs.— Boston; Toronto, 1972.— Vol. 2.— P. 98.
[24] *Gordon G., Folk I.* The War of Ideas.— New York, 1973.— P. 225.
[25] *Lenin. V. I.* A Partnership of Lies // Coll. Works.— Vol. 24.— P. 118.
[26] *Natan J., Oliver J.* United States Foreign Policy and World Order.— Boston; Toronto, 1975.— P. 511.
[27] *Linebarger P.* Psychological Warfare.— Washington, 1948.
[28] *Marchetti V., Marks J.* CIA and Cult of Intelligence.— New York, 1974.— P. 22.

[29] Ibid.— P. 162.
[30] *Rositzke H.* The CIA's Secret Operations: Espionage, Counter-Espionage and Cover Action.— New York, 1977.— P. 152.
[31] *Harris E.* The "Un-American" Weapon: Psychological Warfare.— New York, 1967.— P. 2.
[32] *Rositzke H.* Op. cit.— P. 155.
[33] A Handbook of Slavic Studies.— Cambridge (Mass.), 1949.— P. 726.
[34] *Rositzke H.* Op. cit.— P. 149, 153.
[35] American researchers use the term "Eastern Europe" usually in a political aspect, meaning not only the Socialist nations that emerged after World War II, but also the Ukrainian and other Republics in the Western Soviet regions (*Marchetti V., Marks J.* Op. cit.— P. 112, 239).
[36] Foreign Affairs.— 1975.— Jan.— P. 342.
[37] Daily World.— 1978.— Dec. 29.
[38] The New York Times.— 1977.— Dec. 25.
[39] *Agee Ph.* Inside the Company: CIA Diary.— London, 1975.— P. 70.
[40] Ibid.— P. 68.
[41] *Marchetti V., Marks J.* Op. cit.— P. 169.
[42] *Ranson H.* The Intelligence Establishment.— Cambridge (Mass.), 1970.— P. 225-226.
[43] *Parenty M.* The Anti-Communist Impulse.— New York, 1969.— P. 314.
[44] Daily World.— 1978.— Jan. 5.
[45] Volksstimme.— 1972.— Dez. 24.
[46] *Marchetti V., Marks J.* Op. cit.— P. 135.
[47] Unsere Zeit.— 1977.— Okt. 23.
[48] *Marchetti V., Marks J.*— Op. cit.— P. 352.
[49] The New York Times.— 1977.— Dec. 26.
[50] The Soviet Economy in Regional Perspective.— New York, 1973.— P. 351.
[51] *Lundberg F.* The Rich and Super-Rich.— Toronto, 1969.— P. 498.
[52] *Marchetti V., Marks J.* Op. cit.— P. 171.
[53] *Bletz D.* The Role of the Military Professional in U.S. Foreign Policy.— New York, 1973; *Donovan J.* Militarism, USA.— New York, 1970; *Fulbright J.* The Pentagon Propaganda Machine.— New York, 1970; etc.
[54] *Fulbright J.* Op. cit.— P. 1-2, 28, 143.
[55] The United States Army Combat Forces Journal.— 1953.— Oct.
[56] The Ukrainian Quarterly.— 1956.— N 2.— P. 163.
[57] *Lyons G., Morton L.* Schools for Strategy: Education and Research in National Security Affairs.— New York, 1965.— P. 228, 340.
[58] Ibid.— P. 114.
[59] Svoboda.— 1974.— Jan. 12.
[60] *Donovan J.* Op. cit.— P. 170-175.
[61] *Wise D.* The Politics of Lying.— New York, 1973.— P. 182.
[62] *Donovan J.* Op. cit.— P. 32.
[63] The Ukrainian Quarterly.— 1979.— N 1.— P. 102.
[64] Svoboda.— 1962.— March 3.
[65] Ibid.— July 21.
[66] Ibid.— 1966.— Aug. 20.
[67] Za Rubezhom.— 1980.— N 7.— P. 9.

CHAPTER II

[1] *Engels F.* Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy.— Moscow, 1975.— P. 60-61.

[2] American Teaching About Russia.— Bloomington, 1959.— P. 20.
[3] *Manning C.* A History of Slavic Studies in the United States.— Milwaukee, 1957.— P. 70-72.
[4] *Prouty L.* The Secret Team: The CIA and Its Allies in Control of the United States and the World.— Englewood Cliffs, 1973.— P. 216.
[5] *Burnham J.* Containment or Liberation? — P. 202.
[6] For details about the operation of these centres under Nazi Germany's plans during the inter-war period and in war time see: Zur Ukraine-Politik des deutschen Imperialismus.— Jena, 1969.— S. 125-145.
[7] *Armstrong J.* Ukrainian Nationalism, 1939-1945.— New York, 1963.— P. 320.
[8] Yuvileiniy almanach Ligy amerikans'kyh ukraintsiv, 1924-1974.— New York, 1974.— P. 39.
[9] Narady i uhvaly drugogo vsekrajovogo z'izdu Tovarystva kanadtsiv-ukraintsiv.— Toronto, 1946.— P. 49.
[10] *Vernadsky G.* History of Russia.— New York, 1946.— Vol. 1.— P. VI.
[11] The New York Herald Tribune.— 1957.— Oct. 10.
[12] *Ellsworth R., Harris S.* The American Right Wing.— Washington, 1962.— P. 9.
[13] *Lawrynenko J.* Ukrainian Communism and Soviet Russian Policy Toward the Ukraine: An Annotated Bibliography, 1917-1953.— New York, 1953.— P. IX, 2.
[14] *Sherwin M.* Extremists.— New York, 1963.— P. 90.
[15] *Lenin V. I.* The Second All-Russia Congress of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, October 25/26 (7-8 November), 1917 // Coll. Works.— Vol. 26: Progress Publishers.— Moscow.
[16] *Williams W.* American-Russian Relations.— New York, 1952.— P. 239.
[17] *Sherwin M.* Op. cit.— P. 21.
[18] *Chirovsky N.* An Introduction to Russian History.— New York, 1967.— P. X.
[19] *Ornstein J.* Slavic and East European Studies: Their Development and Status in the Western Hemisphere.— Washington, 1957.— P. 9, 24.
[20] The American Slavic and East European Review.— 1957.— Oct.— P. 381.
[21] Slavic Review.— 1977.— N 2.— P. 889.
[22] *Ornstein J.* Op. cit.— P. 24.
[23] *Bogart L.* Op. cit.— P. 200.
[24] American Teaching about Russia.— P. 25.
[25] The Ukrainian Quarterly.— 1957.— N 2.— P. 152-157.
[26] The American Slavic and East European Review.— 1957.— Oct.— P. 373.
[27] Congressional Record.— 1968.— March 5.— P. S2174.
[28] The American Slavic and East European Review.— 1959.— N 3.— P. 431.
[29] Congressional Record.— 1959.— Apr. 15.— P. A3067.
[30] The Washington Post.— 1982.— June 20.
[31] *Fedyshyn O.* Op. cit.— P. IX.
[32] *Reshetar J.* The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917-1920.— Princeton, 1952; *Armstrong J.* Ukrainian Nationalism, 1939-1945.— New York, 1955.
[33] *Armstrong J.* Op. cit.— P. 277.
[34] *Reshetar J.* Op. cit.— P. 323-330.
[35] Soviet Partisans in World War II.— Madison, 1964.
[36] *Manning C. A.* History of Slavic Studies...— P. 46.
[37] *Elwood R.* Russian Social Democracy in the Underground: A Study of the RSDRP in Ukraine, 1907-1914.— Assen, 1974.— P. 276.
[38] The American Historical Review.— 1976.— N 5.— P. 1184.
[39] *Bilinsky Y.* The Second Soviet Republic: The Ukraine after World War II.— New Brunswick, 1964.— P. 508.

[40] Harvard Ukrainian Studies.— 1977.— N 1.— P. 5.
[41] Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies.— Cambridge (Mass.), 1970-1971.— P. 3.
[42] Svoboda.— 1976.— Febr 7.
[43] The Ukraine within the USSR: An Economic Balance Sheet.— New York.— 1977.— P. VII.
[44] Ibid.— P. 316, 137-154.
[45] Mackiw T. Prince Mazepa, Hetman of the Ukraine in Contemporary English Publications, 1687-1709.— Chicago, 1967.
[46] *Lyons G., Morton L.* Op. cit.— P. 187.
[47] Russian and Soviet Studies at the University of Chicago.— Chicago, 1977.— P. 6-7.
[48] *Smith B.* The RAND Corporation.— Cambridge (Mass.), 1966.— P. 35.
[49] Ukrainians and Jews: A Symp.— New York, 1966.
[50] Slavic Review.— 1967.— N. 3.— P. 495.
[51] Ethnic Minorities in the Soviet Union.— New York, 1968.— P. X, XIV, 124-125.
[52] Canadian Higher Education in the Seventies.— Ottawa, 1972.— P. 100.
[53] Slavistica.— 1958.— N 31.— P. 10.
[54] Register of Scholars, Researchers and Academics in Ukrainian and Ukrainian-Canadian Studies in Canada.— The University of Alberta, 1977-1978.— P. 2-19.
[55] Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia.— Toronto, 1971.— Vol. 2.— P. 1186-1187.
[56] Edmonton Journal.— 1976.— June 19.
[57] Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies.— 1976.— N 1.— P. 92-93, 101.
[58] Newsletter: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies.— 1979.— N 2.— P. 8.
[59] Institute of Historical Research: University of London, Thirty-Seventh Annual Report, Jan. 1959.— London, 1959.— P 16, 23.
[60] The Slavonic and East European Review.— 1966.— Jan.— P. 22.
[61] Slavic Review.— 1973.— N 1.— P. 221.
[62] Svoboda.— 1975.— Oct. 31.
[63] Russian Review.— 1979.— N 1.— P. 56.
[64] Actes de la journée Ivan Franko.— Paris; Munich, 1979.— P. 109-120.
[65] Quoted from: News from Ukraine.— 1982.— N 36.— P. 7.
[66] The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States.— 1972.— N 1/2.— P. 275-276.
[67] The Ukrainians in America.— P. 17.
[68] Quoted from: Pro spravzhne oblychchia ukrains'kogo burzhuaznogo natsionalizmu.— Kiiv, 1974.— P. 128
[69] *Manning C.* Ukraine under the Soviets.— New York, 1953.— P. 9.
[70] Mitteilungen (München).— 1975.— N 12.— S. 121.
[71] Ibid.— 1977.— N 14.— S. 179.
[72] AHA Newsletter.— 1975.— N 5.— P. 13.
[73] The Soviet Studies.— 1966.— N 3.— P. 385.
[74] The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.— 1975.— Jan.— P. 135.
[75] For the scope of historical research in the Ukraine, see: Rozvytok istorichnoi nauky na Ukraini za roky Radyans'koi vlady.— Kiiv, 1973; Istoriografia istorii Ukrainskoi SSR.— Kiev, 1986.
[76] Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies.— 1977.— N 3.— P. 96.
[77] Ibid.— P. 95.
[78] American Teaching about Russia.— P. 19.
[79] *Bilinsky Y.* Op. cit.— P. 9.
[80] *Stachiw M.* Ukraine and Russia: An Outline of History of Politic and Military Relations (Dec. 1917 — Apr. 1918).— New York, 1967,

[81] The American Slavic and East European Review.— 1957.— N 3.- P. 412.
[82] The American Historical Review 1975.— N 5.— P 1604.
[83] *O'Brien C.* Moscovy and the Ukraine.— Berkely; Los Angeles, 1963.— P. V.
[84] Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies.— 1977.— N 2.— P. 94-98; N 3.— P. 120-124.
[85] *Lenin V. I.* National Equality // Coll. Works.— Vol. 20.— P. 238.
[86] The New York Times.— 1946.— Sept. 22.
[87] Ibid.— Sept. 29.
[88] Ibid.— 1964.— May 31.
[89] Ibid.— 1966.— Nov. 19.
[90] Ibid.— 1969.— Febr. 20.
[91] Ibid.— Febr. 23.
[92] *Lenin V. I.* Work of People's Commissariat for Education // Coll. Works.— Vol. 32.— P. 130.
[93] *Rositzke H.* Op. cit.— P. 18-19.
[94] *Gordon G., Folk I.*— Op. cit.— P. 227.
[95] *Hale J.* Radio Power.— London, 1975.— P. XIX.
[96] The Right to Know.— Washington, 1973.— P. 26.
[97] *Czechowicz A.* Sem' trudnykh let.— Moscow, 1975.— P. 197.
[98] Current History.— 1976.— March.— P. 100.
[99] Political Affairs.— 1979.— N 6.— P. 16.

CHAPTER III

[1] *Lenin V. I.* "Who Stands to Gain?" // Coll. Works.— Vol. 19.— P. 53.
[2] Compass of the World: A Symp. on Polit. Georg.— New York, 1944.— P. 35, 39.
[3] Journal of Modern History.— 1947.— N 1.— P. 96.
[4] *Manning C.* Outline of Ukrainian History.— P. 20.
[5] A Handbook of Slavic Studies.— P. 19
[6] *Prokoptschuk G.* Deutsch-ukrainische Geselschaft.— München, 1968.— S. 32.
[7] Ukraine and its People.— Münich, 1949.— P. 129.
[8] *Prokoptschuk G.* Op. cit.— S. 33, 34.
[9] Ibid.— S. 35-40.
[10] Ukrainian Quarterly.— 1956.— N 2.— P. 176.
[11] *Fedoronczuk W.* Il problema ucraino attraverso la storia.— Roma, 1955.— P. 43.
[12] *Chirovsky N.* A History of the Russian Empire.— New York, 1973.— Vol. 1.— P. 75.
[13] Russian Review.— 1977.— N 3.— P. 266.
[14] Canadian Slavonic Papers.— 1972.— N 2.— P. 141.
[15] *Kovalsky N. P.* Istochnikovedenie i arkhivographia istorii Ukrainy XVI — pervoi poloviny XVII v. Part 2. An Analysis of Pre-Revolution National Publications of Sources.— Dnepropetrovsk, 1978.— P. 12-14, 23, etc.
[16] Istoria SSSR s drevneishikh vremen do nashikh dnei.— Moscow, 1967.— Vol. 2.— P. 422, 437, 438, etc.
[17] *Krip'yakevich I. P.* Zv'yazky Zahidnoi Ukrainy z Rosieyu do Seredyny XVII st.— Kiiv, 1953; *Myshko D. I.* Ukrains'ko-rosiys'ki zv'yazky v XIV-XVI st.— Kiiv, 1959.
[18] Russian Imperialism from Ivan the Great to the Revolution.— New Brunswick, 1974.— P. 173.
[19] The New Encyclopaedia Britanica.— Chicago, 1978.— Vol. 18.— P. 838—839.

[20] Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia.— Vol. 1.— P. 951.
[21] Canadian Slavonic Papers.— 1972.— N 2.— P. 951.
[22] *Chirovsky N.* Introduction to Ukrainian History.— New York, 1981.— Vol. 1.— P. 22, 23.
[23] *Lenin V. I.* Better Fewer, but Better // Coll. Works.— Vol. 3.— P. 498.
[24] *Carr E.* Socialism in One Country, 1924-1926.— London, 1959.— 280, 283.
[25] Istoriya Ukrains'koi RSR.— Kiiv, 1977.— Vol. 6.— P. 67, 75.
[26] *Dmytryshyn B.* Moscow and the Ukraine, 1918-1953.— New York, 1956.— P. 195.
[27] *Manning C.* Ukraine under the Soviets.— P. 50.
[28] The research studies in the Ukraine on the Republic's economic recovery problems contain plenty of evidence totally disproving the Sovietological misrepresentation of the reasons behind the rapid industrial revival. See: *Kucher O. O.* Borot'ba robitnykiv Ukrainy za vidbudovu vazhkoi promyslovosti pislya gromadyans'koi viyny.— Kharkiv, 1959; *Samofalov V. M.* Komunistichna partiya Ukrainy v borot'bi za vidbudovu narodnogo gospodarstva (1921—1925).— Kiiv, 1963; etc.
[29] Lenin V. I. Coll. Works.— Vol. 33.— P. 252.
[30] Istoriya Ukrains'koi RSR.— Vol. 6.— P. 32, 33.
[31] *Kolarz W.* Russia and Her Colonies.— New York, 1955.— P. 128; *Pipes R.* The Formation of the Soviet Union.— Cambridge (Mass.), 1954.— P. 126.
[32] *Lenin V. I.* Theses for the Second Congress of the Communist International. Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions // Coll. Works,— Vol. 31, P. 147.
[33] Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia.— Vol. I.— P. 809.
[34] *Borys J.* The Russian Communist Party and the Sovietization of Ukraine.— Stockholm, 1960.— P. 298.
[35] Kommunisticheskaya partiya — vdokhnovitel' i organizator ob'edinitel'nogo dvizheniya ukrainskogo naroda za obrazovanie SSSR: Sbornik dokumentov i materialov.— Kiev, 1972.
[36] Ibid.— P. 450.
[37] Ibid.— P. 534.
[38] Ocherki istorii Kommunisticheskoi partii Ukrainy.— Kiev, 1977.— P. 327-375.
[39] Religion and Atheism in the USSR and Eastern Europe.— London, 1975.— P. 117.
[40] Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia.— Toronto, 1971.— Vol. 2.— P. 170.
[41] *Mihailyk M.* Ukrains'ka kontrrevolutsiya pered proletars'kym sudom.— Kharkiv, 1930.— P. 30.
[42] Tserkva i zhittya.— 1928.— N 2.— P. 84.
[43] Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia.— Vol. 2.— P. 171.
[44] Harvard Ukrainian Studies.— 1979-1980.— Vol. 3/4, pt. 1.— P. 111.
[45] Kommunist.— 1930.— 6 lutogo.
[46] The Ukraine within the USSR: An Economic Balance Sheet.— New York, 1977.— P. 109.
[47] *Koropecky I.* Location Problems in Soviet Industry before World War II: The Case of the Ukraine.— Chapell Hill, 1971.— P. 15.
[48] *Manning C.* The History of the Ukraine.— New York, 1947.— P. 283.
[49] Istoriya Ukrains'koi RSR.— Vol. 6.— P. 173, 186.
[50] *Krivonos V. M.* Vklad rabochego klassa Ukrainy v zavoevanie tekhniko-ekonomicheskoi nezavisimosti SSSR.— Kiev, 1982.— P. 115.
[51] Voprosy istorii.— 1968.— N 7.— P. 187.
[52] *Melnyk Z.* Soviet Capital Formation: Ukraine 1928/29-1932.— Munich, 1965.
[53] For the sources of the Socialist industrialization of the Ukraine, see:

Kulchycky S. V. Uchast' robitnykiv Ukrainy u stvorenni fondu sotsialistychnoi industrializatsii.— Kiiv, 1975.
[54] Istoriya natsional'no-gosudarstvennogo stroitel'stva v SSSR (1917-1936).— Moscow, 1968.— P. 445.
[55] *Koropecky I. Op.* cit.— P. 82, 86, 87.
[56] Istoriya Ukrains'koi RSR.— Vol. 6,— P. 315.
[57] *Koropecky I.* Op. cit.— P. 86.
[58] Istoriya Ukrains'koi RSR.— Vol. 6.— P. 202, 318.
[59] Soviet Studies.— 1983.— N 4.— P. 497.
[60] *Kuts M. T.* Pytannya kolgospnogo budivnytstva na Ukraini (1929-1941).— L'viv, 1965.— P. 14-15.
[61] Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia.— Vol. 1.— P. 816.
[62] Soviet Nationalities Policy in Practice.— New York, 1967.— P. 93.
[63] Ibid.
[64] *Manning C.* Ukraine under the Soviets.— P. 94.
[65] Sullivant R. Soviet Pollitics and the Ukraine, 1917-1957.— New York, 1962.— P. 188.
[66] Soviet Studies.— 1964.— N 3.— P. 265; *Hudson G.* Fifty Years of Communism: Theory and Practice, 1917-1967.— Baltimore, 1968.— P. 105.
[67] Ocherki istorii Kommunisticheskoi partii Ukrainy.— P. 471.
[68] Kommunisticheskaya partiya Ukrainy v rezolutsiyakh i resheniyakh syezdov, konferentsiy i plenumov TsK.— Kiev, 1976.— Vol. 1.— P. 823.
[69] Ibid.— P. 786.
[70] Leniskiy plan postroeniya sotsializma i yego osushchestvlenie na Ukraine.— Kiev, 1982.— P. 297.
[71] Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopaedia.— Vol. 1.— P. 826.
[72] *Carr E.* Socialism in One Country.— P. 240.
[73] *Dmytryshyn B.* Moscow and the Ukraine.— P. 70.
[74] *Borys J.* Op. cit.— P. 323.
[75] Slavic Review.— 1982.— N 4.— P. 685.
[76] Kommunisticheskaya partiya Ukrainy v rezolutsiyakh...— Vol. 1.— P. 224.
[77] *Dmytryshyn B.* Moscow and the Ukraine.— P. 70.
[78] *Yasnyts'kiy G. I.* Rozvytok narodnoi osvity na Ukraini (1921-1932).— Kiiv, 1965.— P. 27.
[79] Istoriya Ukrains'koi RSR.— Vol. 6.— P. 84-85, 92, etc.
[80] Soviet Nationalities Policy in Practice.— P. 63.
[81] *Dmytryshyn B.* Moscow and the Ukraine.— P. 90.
[82] *Barghoorn F.* Soviet Russian Nationalism.— Westport (Conn.), 1977.— P. 36-37; *Tillet L.* The Great Friendship.— Chapell Hill, 1969.— P. 36.
[83] Handbook of Major Soviet Nationalities.— New York, 1975.— P. 28.
[84] The New Encyclopaedia Britanica.— 1978.— Vol. 18.— P. 839.
[85] Soviet Nationalities Policy in Practice.— P. 92.
[86] *Kolarz W.* Op. cit.— P. 129.
[87] *Tillet L.* Op. cit.— P. 37.
[88] *Gurnitsky K. I.* Agafangel Yefimovich Krymskiy.— Moscow, 1980.— P. 126-139.
[89] Istoriya Ukrains'koi RSR.— Vol. 6.— P. 410—412.
[90] For details about this movement, see: *Gerasymenko M. P., Dudykevych B. K.* Borot'ba trudyaschykh Zahidnoi Ukrainy za vozz'ednannya z Radyans'koyu Ukrainoiu (1921-1939).— Kiiv, 1960.
[91] *Manning C.* A Story of the Ukraine.— P. 269.
[92] *Sorlin P.* The Soviet People and Their Society from 1917 to the Present.— New York, 1969.— P. 180.
[93] Handbook of Major Soviet Nationalities.— P. 40.
[94] *Kolasky J.* Education in Soviet Ukraine.— Toronto, 1968.— P. XIII.
[95] The Ukrainian Quarterly.— 1983.— N 3.— P. 283.

[96] *Garovsky F. Y.* Sovetskiy narod kak internatsional'naya obshchnost'.— Kiev, 1983.— P. 116.
[97] Narodne gospodarstvo Ukrains'koi RSR: Statystichniy shchorichnyk: Do 60-richchya utvorrennya Soyuzu Radyans'kykh Sotsialistychnykh Respublik.— Kiiv, 1982.— P. 343.
[98] *Bilinsky Y.* Second Soviet Republic.— P. 90.
[99] *Beloded I. K.* Yazyk i ideologicheskaya bor'ba.— Kiev, 1974.— P. 10.
[100] *Lenin V. I.* Liberals and Democrats on the Language Question // Coll. Works.— Vol. 19.— P. 354.
[101] *Gorovskiy F. Y.* Op. cit.— P. 85.
[102] The Oppression of the Ukrainian Activities in 1876.— Münich, 1970.
[103] Handbook of Major Soviet Nationalities.— P. 28.
[104] *Teslya I., Yuzik P.* Ukraintsi v Kanadi v 1971.— Toronto, 1974.— P. 60.
[105] Journal of Ukrainian Graduate Studies.— 1977.— N 3.— P. 72, 74.
[106] Problems of Communism.— 1953.— N 6.— P. 46-57.
[107] *Farmer K.* Ukrainian Nationalism in Post-Stalin Era.— The Hague, 1980.
[108] Problems of Communism.— 1979.— N. 4.— P. 72.
[109] Programme of the CPSU.— Moscow, 1986.
[110] Harris E. The "Un-American" Weapon: Psychological Warfare.— New York, 1967.— P. 6.
[111] *Smith B.* Op. cit.— P. 13.
[112] *Parenty M.* Op. cit.— P. 84.
[113] *Codo E.* Guerilla Warfare in Ukraine.— Milit. Rev.— 1960.— Sept.
[114] *Tys-Krojmaluk Y.* Guerra y libertad: Historia de la division *Halychina.*— Buenos Aires, 1961.
[115] *Codo E.* Guerrilas tras la cortina de hierro.— Buenos Aires, 1966.— P. 17.
[116] The Ukrainian Quarterly.— 1965.— N 2.— P. 121.
[117] Congressional Record 1967.— Jan. 25.— P. H597-H627.
[118] Ibid.— June 15.— P. S8290.
[119] Ukrainian American.— 1971.— N 11.
[120] Ukrains'ki visti (New York).— 1971.— 4 berez.
[121] *Tys-Krochmaliuk V.* UPA Warfare in Ukraine.— New York, 1972.— P. IX, 400.
[122] Eastern Europe in the 1970s.— New York, 1974.— P. 177.
[123] Slavic Review.— 1979.— N 1.— P. 137.
[124] The American Historical Review.— 1981.— N 2.— P. 431.
[125] Nationalities Papers.— 1982.— N 1.— P. 1-39.
[126] Luds'koi krovi ne zmyty: Knyga faktiv.— Kiiv, 1970.— P. 94-99; Ukrainskaya SSR v Velikoi Otechestvennoi voine Sovetskogo Soyuza, 1941-1945.— Kiev, 1975.— Vol. 3.— P. 137-150.
[127] *Kulchycky G.* The Ukrainian Insurgent Movement 1919 to 1926.— Washington, 1970.— (Unpubl. Diss.).
[128] Minutes of the Seminar in Ukrainian Studies.— Cambridge (Mass.), 1970/1971.— N 1.— P. 6.
[129] *Peters V.* Nestor Machno.— Winnipeg, 1970; *Palij M.* The Anarchism of Nestor Machno, 1918-1921.— Seattle, 1976; *Malet M.* Nestor Machno in the Russian Civil War.— London, 1982.
[130] *Palij M.*— Op. cit.— P. 250.
[131] The Slavonic and East European Review.— 1983.— N 2.— P. 293.
[132] For more on this see: *Kucher O. O.* Rozgrom zbroinoi vnutrishn'oi kontrrevolutsii na Ukraini v 1921-1923 rr.— Kharkiv, 1971.— P. 10-11.
[133] Istoriya Ukrains'koi RSR.— Vol. 6.— P. 26.
[134] Kommunisticheskaya partiya — vdokhnovitel' i organizator ob'edinitel'nogo dvizheniya ukrainskogo naroda za obrazovanie SSSR.— P. 473.
[135] Istoriya Ukrains'koi RSR.— Vol. 6.— P. 26.

[136] *Kucher O. O.* Vkaz. pratsia.— P. 127.
[137] *Kulchycky G.* Op. cit.— P. 256, 257, 267.
[138] *Lawrynenko J.*— Op. cit.— P. 1.
[139] *Majstrenko I.* Borot'bism: A Chapter in the History of Ukrainian Communism.— New York, 1954.
[140] The American Slavic and East European Review.— 1957.— N 3.— P. 211-212; Journal of Modern History.— 1957.— N 2.— P. 155.
[141] *Barghoorn F.* Soviet Russian Nationalism.— P. 38.
[142] The American Slavic and East European Review.— 1957.— N 4.— P. 589.
[143] These terms originated from the names of individuals committed to nationalistic deviationism in the Ukraine in the 20s. For an assessment of their activities, see: Ocherki istorii Kommunisticheskoi partii Ukrainy.— P. 385.
[144] The American Historical Review.— 1957.— N 4.— P. 915.
[145] *Khvylovy M.* Stories from Ukraine.— New York, 1960.
[146] Slavic Review.— 1961.— N 3.— P. 542, 543.
[147] *Sullivant R.* Op. cit.— P. 119.
[148] Ibid.— P. 120.
[149] *Borys J.* Op. cit.— P. 120, 250.
[150] *Sullivant R.* Op. cit.— P. 120.
[151] Ocherki istorii Kommunisticheskoi partii Ukrainy.— P. 364.
[152] *Sullivant R.* Op. cit.— P. 120.
[153] *Borys J.* Op. cit.— P. 251.
[154] Kak i pochemu Ispolkom Kominterna raspustil UKP.— Kharkov, 1925.— P. 47.
[155] *Sullivant R.* Op. cit.— P. 120.
[156] *Skilling H.* Communism National and International.— Toronto, 1964.— P. 3, 161.
[157] Uroki krizisnogo razvitiya v Kompartii Chekhoslovakii i obshchestve posle XIII s'ezda KPCH: the document adopted by the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the CPCz in December, 1970.— Moscow, 1971.— P. 10, 43.
[158] Sunday Bulletin.— 1968.— Febr. 4.
[159] *Hodnett G., Potichnyj P.* The Ukraine and the Czechoslovak Crisis.— Canberra, 1970.— P. 74.
[160] Ibid.— P. V, 6—7, 8.
[161] *Mace J.* Communism and the Dilemmas of National Liberation: National Communism in Soviet Ukraine, 1918—1933.— Cambridge (Mass.), 1983.— P. 161-192, etc.
[162] Eastern Europe in the 1970s.— P. 187-188.
[163] The Right to Know.— P. 91.
[164] Political Leadership of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.— Chicago, 1970.— P. 28.
[165] *Mazlach S., Shakrai V.* On the Current Situation in the Ukraine.— Ann Arbor, 1970.— P. XXXI—XXXII.
[166] *Lenin V. I.* Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx // Coll. Works.— Vol. 18.— P. 584.
[167] *Nahayewsky* I. History of the Modern Ukrainian State, 1917-1923.— Munich, 1966.— P. 7.
[168] *Isaiw P.* The Causes of the Fall of the Ukrainian State in Princely and Cossack Times.— Roma, 1975.— P. 81.
[169] *Kushnir M.* Perspektyvy ukrains'kogo khrystiyans'kogo natsionalizmu.— Filadel'fiya, 1973.— P. 4.
[170] *Isaiw P.* Op. cit.— P. 115.
[171] *Welykyj A.* Le luce e le ombre della storia ucraina.— Roma, 1969.— P. 7, 10.
[172] Istoriya Ukrainskoi SSR.— Kiev, 1982.— Vol. 1.— P. 338.

[173] Analecta ordinis s. Basilii magni.— Romae, 1954.— Vol. 2, fasc. 1/2.— P. 134.
[174] Pravda pro uniyu: Dokumenty i materialy.— L'viv, 1981.— P. 21-22.
[175] The Slavonic and East European Review.— 1957.— Dec.— P. 210, 233.
[176] *Welykyj A.* Op. cit.— P. 11.
[177] *Nahayewsky I.* Op. cit.— P. 15.
[178] Documenta Pontificum Romanorum historiam Ukrainae illustratia.— Romae, 1953.— Vol. 1.— P. 50.
[179] *Chirovsky N.* A History of Russian Empire.— Vol. 1.— P. 193.
[180] *Nahayewsky I.* Op. cit.— P. 15.
[181] Documenta Pontificum Romanorum...— P. 447.
[182] *Lowrence J. A* History of Russia.— New York, 1960.— P. 111.
[183] *Dmytryshyn B.* History of Russia.— Englewood Cliffs, 1977.— P. 201.
[184] *Engels F.* The Peasant War in Germany.— Moscow, 1977.— P. 42.
[185] Istoriya Ukrains'koi RSR.— Kiiv, 1978.— Vol. 3.— P. 200.
[186] *Franko I.* Zibr. tvoriv: U 50-ti t.— Kiiv, 1980.— Vol. 26.— P. 89.
[187] Religion and Atheism in the USSR and Eastern Europe.— London, 1975.— P. 117; Nationalism and Human Rights.— Littleton, 1977.— P. 157.
[188] For details about the connections of the Uniate Church with fascism, see: *Dmitruk K. E.* Pryrecheni.— L'viv, 1981.— P. 66-95.
[189] For instance, C. Lane of Cambridge University has emphasized that the Uniate Church is an exponent of the most aggressive type of nationalism. See: *Lane C.* Christian Religion in the Soviet Union.— London, 1978.— P. 198.
[190] *Falconi C.* The Silence of Pius XII.— London, 1970.— P. 216.
[191] The Encyclopedia Americana.— New York, 1973.— Vol. 27.— P. 341. For a true account of the severance of the union proclaimed by the L'viv Conclave of the Greek Catholic Church in 1946, see, for instance: *Dmitruk K. E.* Pid shtandartamy reaktsii i fashyzmu.— Kiiv, 1976.— P. 273-286.
[192] *Dunn D.* The Catholic Church and the Soviet Government, 1939-1949.— Boulder, 1977.

CONCLUSION

[1] Russian Review.— 1978.— N 2.— P. 239.
[2] Pravda.— 1986.— Febr. 26.
[3] Pravda.— 1987.— 18. Febr.

INDEX OF NAMES

Agee Ph. 20, 21
Alexander B. 40
Alexander IV 148
Allworth E. 45
Aptheker H. 76
Armstrong J. 43, 44, 49, 67, 127
Barghoorn F. 109, 132, 138, 140
Bilinsky Y. 66
Bociurkiw B. 14, 22, 96
Boiko Y. 81
Borecky M. 96
Borys J. 107, 135
Bosh A. 14
Bouscaren A. 37
Brademas J. 41
Bradley J. 128
Bronson D. 47
Brzezinski Z. 7, 16, 45, 71, 137, 138, 140
Burnham J. 6, 33, 62
Byeloded I. K. 116
Byrnes R. 76
Carr E. H. 37, 90, 106
Carrère d'Encausse H. 55
Chamberlin W. 37
Chirovsky N. 38, 65, 82, 148
Chubaty N. 38, 58
Codo E. 123
Czechowicz A. 21, 75
Dallin A. 66
Dalrymple D. 105
Daniil of Galich 147, 148
Derwinski E. 124
Deutsch K. 5
Dmytryshyn B. 66, 88, 106, 108
Dobriansky L. 14, 25
Donovan J. 28
Dontsov D. 55, 143
Doroshenko D. 62, 81
Dulles A. 18
Dulles J. F. 132
Dunn D. 154
Dyminsky D. 80
Eisenhower D. 8, 24
Ellsworth R. 36
Elwood R. 44
Engels F. 32, 69
Falconi C. 153
Farmer K. 120, 127
Fedoronczuk W. 81
Fedyshyn O. 7
Fomin A. V. 110
Franko I. 54, 151
Frederiksen O. 19, 79
Frunze M. 129, 130
Fulbright J. W. 24
Gallan W. 26
Gamaleya M. F. 110
Gillula J. 47
Golovacky J. 151
Gorbachev M. S. 162
Gregory VII 146
Hale J. 75
Halecki O. 79
Hall G. 20, 30
Halperin M. 21
Harriman A. 38
Harris S. 36
Harrison W. 29
Hattenbach H. 83
Herasymiv B. 126
Hodnett G. 139, 140
Holt P. 11
Holubnychy V. 120
Horak S. 126
Horbač O. 59
Hrushevsky M. S. 110
Hudson G. 105
Hunter H. 47
Innocentius IV 146
Izyaslav 146
Janiw W. 85
Johnson L. 7
Kamenetsky I. 66, 67
Kashchenko M. F. 110
Kennan G. 14, 15
Kersten Ch. 13, 14
Khvylovy M. 133, 139

Klymenko P. 129
Koch H. 53
Kohn H. 45
Koropecky I. 101
Kosinec E. 65
Krupnycky B. 82
Krymsky A. E. 111
Kubijovič V. 60
Kulchycky G. 65, 127, 130
Kushnir M. 143
Kuusinen O. 136
Lawrynenko J. 37
Lenin V. I. 16, 37, 38, 69, 78, 86, 89, 114, 117, 121, 141
Lippmann W. 35
Lipsky V. I. 110
Liver J. 107
Luckyj G. 53, 132, 133, 140
Lundberg F. 23
Luther M. 7, 132, 140
Lyons G. 25
McCarthy J. 35
Mace J. 102, 140
Machno N. 127, 128
Mackiw Th. 47
Malet M. 127, 128
Manning C. 44, 60, 63
Marchetti V. 20, 22
Marks J. 20, 22
Markus V. 48
Marx K. 69, 141
Mazepa I. 48
Melnyk Z. 99
Morton L. 25
Mosely Ph. 9, 36, 43, 44, 57
Nahayewsky I. 142, 149
O'Brien C. 68
Osadčuk B. 75
Overholser E. 29
Palij M. 127, 128
Pap M. 28, 49
Parenty M. 21, 122
Peters V. 127
Petlyura S. 68, 96, 128, 130, 139
Petrovsky G. I. 93
Pipes R. 9, 47, 138
Pisarzhevsky L. V. 110
Pius XII 153
Portal R. 90
Possony S. 24
Potichnyj P. 139, 140
Praeger F. 22
Primakov V. M. 129
Pritsak O. 82
Pyatnitsky I. A. 136
Ranson H. 21
Raser P. 12
Reshetar J. 43—45, 48, 132
Rohrbach P. 62, 80
Roosevelt E. K. 25, 138
Roosevelt F. D. 38
Rositzke H. 19
Rudnytsky I. 53, 124, 133
Rudnytsky J. 60
Sander H. 80
Sargeant H. 57
Sen Katayama 136
Shakespeare F. 28
Shandruk P. 59
Shapiro L. 16
Shashkevich M. 151
Shevchenko T. 70
Short D. 16
Sigismund III 149
Skilling H. 137, 140
Smal-Stocki R. 36
Smith B. 48
Strausz-Hupé R. 48
Strobel G. 126
Sullivant R. 67, 105, 134, 135
Szeptyckyj A. 152, 153
Tillet L. 109, 110
Thomson W. 28
Truman H. 8, 34, 50
Tutkovsky P. A. 110
Tys-Krochmaliuk J. 123
Tyutyunnyk J. 130
Ukrainka L. 55
Urban VIII 149
Vagilevich I. 151
Vernadsky G. 35
Vernadsky V. I. 110
Veryha W. 115
Vladimir 145
Walsh E. 79
Weinryb B. 45
Welykyj A. 147
Whitehouse F. 47
Wiles P. 47
Williams W. A. 38
Wise D. 28
Yakovliv A. 81
Yareshchenko A. 136
Yaroslav, the Wise 147
Young M. 16, 124
Zetkin K. 136
Zinner P. 140
ZumBrunner C. 97

CONTENTS

Foreword 3

Chapter I

Social Customers for Hostile Stereotypes

1. Under Imperial Doctrines 5
2. Legislators Committed to Extra-Constitutionalism 11
3. Behind the Scenes of Psychological Warfare 18
4. Under the Plans of the Military-Industrial Complex 24

Chapter II

"Ukrainian Studies": Centres and Their Purposes

1. Integration of Nazi Ostforschers 32
2. Pentagon Principles: Area Programmes 39
3. Under Scholarly Pretence 43
4. "Free Science in Diaspora": Fact and Fiction 56
5. Juggling with Documentary Evidence 64
6. Wedded to Propaganda 69

Chapter III

Historiography at the Service of Imperialist Policy

1. To Suit Geopolitics 78
2. Record of Socialism in the Distorting Mirror of Sovietology . . 86
3. The Bogey of "Denationalization" Behind a Scientific Signboard 113
4. The Doctrine of Counter-Insurgency in its "Historical" Retrospect 121
5. Under the False Flag of "National Communism" 131
6. Clerical Way of Writing History 141

Conclusion 156

References and Footnotes 163

Index of Names 173

Академия наук Украинской ССР
Институт истории

Николай Николаевич
Варварцев

История Украины в кривом зеркале советологии

(На английском языке)

Изд. № 170

1 rbl. 80 cop.

Naukova Dumka
Publishers